arXiv:1604.01529v2 [cs.GT] 2 Nov 2016

Axiomatic Characterization of Committee Scoring Rules

Piotr Skowron
University of Oxford
Oxford, UK

Piotr Faliszewski
AGH University
Krakow, Poland

Arkadii Slinko
University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand

November 3, 2016

Abstract

Committee scoring rules form a rich class of aggregators of voters' preferences for the purpose of selecting subsets of objects with desired properties, e.g., a shortlist of candidates for an interview, a representative collective body such as a parliament, or a set of locations for a set of public facilities. In the spirit of celebrated Young's characterization result that axiomatizes single-winner scoring rules, we provide an axiomatic characterization of multiwinner committee scoring rules. We show that committee scoring rules—despite forming a remarkably general class of rules—are characterized by the set of four standard axioms, anonymity, neutrality, consistency and continuity, and by one axiom specific to multiwinner rules which we call committee dominance. In the course of our proof, we develop several new notions and techniques. In particular, we introduce and axiomatically characterize multiwinner decision scoring rules, a class of rules that broadly generalizes the well-known majority relation.

1 Introduction

One of the most influential results in social choice, Arrow's impossibility theorem [1], states that when voters have three or more distinct alternatives (candidates) to choose from, no social welfare function can map the ranked preferences of individuals into a transitive social preference order while satisfying four axioms called unrestricted domain, non-dictatorship, Pareto efficiency, and independence of irrelevant alternatives. Arrow's axioms are reasonable at the individual level of cognition but appeared too strong to require from a social perspective (this seems particularly true for the independence of irrelevant alternatives axiom). The result was negative but it had two important consequences. First, knowing what is impossible to achieve is important. Second, Arrow created a framework for developing a positive approach to the social choice theory, i.e., a framework for investigations of what is actually possible to achieve. Indeed, numerous axiomatic characterizations of existing voting rules followed Arrow's work (these are too numerous to list here, see the survey of Chebotarev and Shamis [13] for a comprehensive list of such characterizations, as well as Section 2 where we outline work related to ours). This was foreshadowed to a certain extent by May who in a highly original paper axiomatically characterized the simple majority rule [40] (but in a narrow framework that did not allow for generalizations).

Most common voting rules have been introduced without normative considerations. Hence a discovery of an axiomatic characterization for a voting rule is hard to overestimate. When we axiomatically characterize a rule, we are discovering sets of axioms that we know in advance are consistent (in particular, the rule that is characterized satisfies all of them). This is, in fact, where the normative theory begins: a commitment to a particular voting rule is a commitment to the set of axioms that define this rule. Now, if electoral designers compare two voting rules, they can look at them from different 'angles' where each axiom provides them with a certain 'view' of the rule. These 'views' can be interpreted as behavioral characteristics with normative implications. Comparisons of such characteristics can cause an electoral designer to prefer one rule to another.

In the process of investigating various voting rules, several axioms were identified that are not only reasonable at the individual level but also leave enough room for a wide class of procedures for aggregating preferences of the society. Among them, one of the most important is consistency,[1] introduced by Smith [56] and adopted by Young [62]. Consistency says that if two societies decide on the same set of options and if both societies prefer option x to option y, then the union of these two societies should also prefer x to y. Amazingly, together with the symmetry (which says that all alternatives and all voters are treated equally) and continuity,[2] consistency uniquely defines the class of scoring social welfare functions [56, 62], which are also called positionalist voting rules [28, 44] or, perhaps more commonly, positional scoring rules. These rules are defined as follows. Given voters' rankings over alternatives, each alternative earns points from each voter's ranking depending on its position in that ranking. The alternative x is then at least as high in the social order as y if the total number of points that x garnered from all the voters is at least as large as for y. Young also obtained a similar axiomatic characterization of social choice functions [60], which, unlike social welfare functions, determine only the winner(s). These characterizations of scoring rules made it possible to axiomatize some particular scoring rules, most notably Borda [59] and Plurality [49] (see also the work of Merlin [41] for a refined presentation of Young's result, and the survey of Chebotarev and Shamis [13] for a comprehensive list of axiomatic characterizations of voting rules).

The study of single-winner voting rules is now well-advanced [3, 2]. This is not the case for the multi-winner voting rules, i.e., for the rules that aim at electing committees. The only success in their axiomatic study was Debord's characterization of the k-Borda voting rule [16] by methods similar to Young's. In this paper we provide axiomatic characterization of committee scoring rules—the multiwinner analogues of single-winner scoring rules, recently introduced by Elkind et al. [17]—in the style of Smith's and Young's results for the single-winner case [56, 62].

In our model of a multiwinner election, we are given a set of candidates, a collection of voters with preferences over these candidates, and an integer k. A multiwinner voting rule is an algorithm that allows us to compare any two committees (i.e., two subsets of candidates of size k) on the basis of preferences of the voters and, in particular, it allows us to identify the best committee. In other words, multiwinner voting rules are assumed to produce weak linear orders over the committees. Multiwinner elections of this type are interesting for a number of reasons, and, in particular, due to a wide range of their applications. For example, we may use multiwinner elections to choose a country's parliament, to identify a list of webpages a search engine should display in response to a

[1] In Smith's terminology, separability [56].

[2] In Smith's terminology, Archimedean [56]

query, to choose locations for a set of facilities (e.g., hospitals or fire stations) in a city, to short-list a group of candidates for a position or a prize, to decide which set of products a company should offer to its customers (if there is a limited advertising space), or even as part of a genetic algorithm [18]. There are many other applications and we point the reader to the works of Lu and Boutilier [38, 39], Elkind et al. [17], and Skowron et al. [54] for more detailed discussions of them (including the applications mentioned above).

Multiwinner voting rules differ from their single-winner counterparts in several important aspects. First of all, some multiwinner voting rules take into account possible interdependence between the committee members—the issue which does not exist when the goal is to select a single winning candidate. The valuation of a candidate may depend not only on the voters' preferences but also on who the other committee members would be. For example, in some cases it is important to diversify the committee, e.g., when we are choosing locations for a set of facilities like hospitals, when we are choosing a set of advertisements (within the given budget) to reach the broadest possible audience of customers, or when we want to provide a certain level of proportionality of representation in a collective body such as a parliament.

Identifying the class of committee scoring rules has been a recent, important step on the way of getting a better understanding of multiwinner voting rules [17]. Committee scoring rules extend their single-winner counterparts as follows. Let us recall that a single-winner scoring rule is based on a scoring function that, given a position of a candidate in a vote (that is, in the ranking of candidates provided by the voter), outputs the number of points that the candidate gets from this particular voter. The overall score of a candidate in the election is the sum of the points she gets from all the votes, and the candidate with the highest overall score wins. In the case of committee scoring rules, we elect not a single candidate but a committee of size k, so we need a different notion of a position. Specifically, we say that the position of a committee in a given vote is the set of positions of its members in this vote. A committee scoring function then assigns points to each possible position of a committee (with m candidates and committee size k, there are $\binom{m}{k}$ such committee positions) and the total score of a committee is the sum of the points it gets from all the voters. Then committee X is at least as good as committee Y if the total number of points that committee X receives is at least as large as the number of points of committee Y. We view committee scoring rules as social welfare functions, generalized to the multiwinner setting; in this respect, our approach is closer to that of Smith [56], Young [62], and Merlin [41] rather than to that of Young [60].

Although this generalization of single-winner voting rules to committee scoring rules is quite natural, one can expect much more diversity in the multiwinner case. And this is indeed the case: the committee scoring rules form a remarkably wide class of multiwinner election rules, which includes simple "best k" rules such as SNTV or k-Borda (which select k candidates that are ranked first most often, or that have the highest Borda scores, respectively), more involved rules, such as the Chamberlin–Courant rule [12] that focuses on providing proportional representation, or even more complex selection procedures, such as the variants of the OWA-based rules of Skowron et al. [54] and Aziz et al. [6], or decomposable rules of Faliszewski et al. [19] with applications reaching far beyond political science.

It is, therefore, remarkable that the committee scoring rules admit an axiomatic characterization very similar in spirit to the celebrated characterization of single-winner scoring rules. Our first main

result is as follows.

Theorem A (**Axiomatic Characterization of Committee Scoring Rules).** *A multiwinner voting rule is a committee scoring rule if and only if it is symmetric, consistent, continuous, and satisfies committee dominance.*

Let us give an informal description of the axioms in this characterization and explain the appearance of committee dominance among them. Symmetry, as in the single-winner case, simply means that all the voters and candidates are treated in a uniform way. This is a standard, widely accepted requirement, and cannot be disputed if the society adheres to the basic principles of equality both for the voters and for the candidates.

The requirement of consistency is easily adapted to the multiwinner case. It says that if there are two groups of voters and for both of them our voting rule shows that committee C_1 is at least as good as committee C_2, then the rule must show that C_1 is at least as good as C_2 when the two groups join together in a single electorate. We saw that in the case of single-winner rules this requirement is rather appealing. Rejecting it would be difficult to justify from the point of view of social philosophy as it would mean that we treat large and small societies differently.

Let us now explain continuity. Again two societies are involved. Suppose that for the first one the voting rule outputs that committee C_1 is at least as good as committee C_2 and for the second one it outputs the opposite conclusion, that committee C_2 is strictly better than committee C_1. Then, if we join together the first society and the second society cloned sufficiently many times, then for the combined society the rule will output that C_2 is strictly better than committee C_1. That is, continuity ensures that large enough majority of a population always gets its choice.[3]

Now, we move to the new axiom which we call committee dominance. This axiom requires that if there are two committees, X and Y, such that every voter can pair the candidates in X with candidates in Y into a sequence of pairs $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_k, y_k)$ so that for every pair (x_i, y_i) this voter weakly prefers x_i to y_i, then the society weakly prefers X to Y. This is an incarnation, in the case of multiwinner rules, of the famous Pareto Principle which is the least disputable principle in social choice. Any libertarian philosopher would agree that if such a concept like social preference is at all used, then it should be derived in some systematic way from individual preferences, and this inevitably leads to the Pareto Principle. The requirement of committee dominance is, in fact, a part of the definition of committee scoring rules [17], so it cannot be avoided here. Committee dominance can also be seen as a weak form of monotonicity (see the works of Elkind et al. [17] and Faliszewski et al. [19] for extended discussions of various multiwinner monotonicity notions). In his definition of scoring functions, Young disregards monotonicity considerations and his scoring functions can assign a higher score to a lower position, but if one were to use the standard definition of a single-winner scoring rule which is predominantly used in social choice and which stipulates that a higher position yields a number of points that is at least as high as for any lower position, then one would have to add to Young's characterization an axiom enforcing the Pareto Principle too.

Unfortunately, the original Young's technique cannot be applied to prove Theorem A. Some observations critical to Young's approach cannot be extended to multiwinner case. For instance,

[3] Smith refers to continuity as the Archimedean property and this is a better name for it but, we stick to Young's terminology.

Young's analysis heavily relies on the fact that for any two ordered pairs of candidates (a_1, a_2) and (b_1, b_2) there is a permutation of the set of candidates that maps a_1 to b_1 and a_2 to b_2. This however fails for two pairs of committees (C_1, C_2) and (C_3, C_4) since the intersections $C_1 \cap C_2$ and $C_3 \cap C_4$ may have different cardinalities. As a result, the neutrality axiom (symmetry with respect to the candidates) has much less bite in the context of multiwinner elections.

Our approach is based on the novel concept of a decision rule (or, a k-decision rule if we fix the cardinality k of the committees involved). Given a profile of the society and two committees of size k, a k-decision rule tells us which committee is better for this society (or that they are equally good). However, as opposed to our multiwinner rules, decision rules are not required to be transitive (e.g., it is perfectly legal for a decision rule to say that committee C_1 is better than C_2, that C_2 is better than C_3, and that C_3 is better than C_1). We note that all the properties of symmetry, consistency and continuity are equally applicable to decision rules as to multiwinner rules.

In the class of decision rules, we distinguish the class of decision scoring rules that is much broader than the class of committee scoring rules. A decision scoring rule stipulates that any linear order in the profile, 'awards' points (positive or negative) to pairs of committees. If in a ranking v committees C_1 and C_2 have, respectively, committee positions I_1 and I_2, then this pair of committees gets $d(I_1, I_2)$ points from v, where d is a certain function that returns real values. The score of an ordered pair of committees (C_1, C_2) is the total number of points that this pair gets from all linear orders of the profile. If the score is positive, then C_1 is strictly preferred over C_2. If it is negative, then C_2 is strictly preferred over C_1. Otherwise, if the score is zero, the two committees are declared equally good. Decision scoring rules, while a bit counterintuitive at first, are a very general and useful notion. For example, one can easily show a decision scoring rule that generates the standard majority relation, where alternative a is preferred to alternative b if and only if more voters place a higher than b than the other way around.

As indicated above, decision scoring rules are a very broad class that goes far beyond committee scoring rules. It is, therefore, quite surprising that we can still obtain an axiomatic characterization for them (especially that it uses the same axioms as Young's characterization of single-winner scoring rules [60] adapted to the multiwinner setting):

Theorem B (**Axiomatic Characterization of Decision Scoring Rules).** *A decision rule is a decision scoring rule if and only if it is symmetric, consistent and continuous.*

Since decision rules generalize the notion of the majority relation, this result opens a possibility to use ideas from the theory of tournament solution concepts in future research on multiwinner rules (for an overview of tournament theory, see, e.g., the book of Laslier [37]). Our theorem says that decision scoring rules form the unique class of functions mapping voters' preferences to tournaments and satisfying the above three axioms.

This paper is organized as follows. First, in Section 2 we discuss related work and then, in Section 3, we provide necessary background regarding multiwinner elections and committee scoring rules. In Section 4 we formally describe the axioms that we use in our characterization. Section 5 contains our main result and its proof. The proof is quite involved and is divided into two parts. First, we provide a variant of our characterization for decision rules (for this part of the proof, we use a technique that is very different from that used by Young). Second, we build an inductive argument

with Young's characterization providing us with the induction base to obtain our final result (while this part of the proof is inspired by Young's ideas, it uses new technical approaches and tricks), using results from the first part as tools. We conclude in Section 6.

2 Related Work

Axiomatic characterizations of single-winner election rules have been actively studied for quite a long time. Indeed, the classical theorem of Arrow [1] and the related, and equally important, result of Gibbard [29] and Satterthwaite [51] can be seen as axiomatic characterizations of the dictatorial rule[4] (however, typically these theorems are considered as impossibility results, taking the view of an electoral designer). Other well-known axiomatic characterizations of single-winner rules include the characterizations of the majority rule[5] due to May [40] and Fishburn [22], several different characterizations of the Borda rule [59, 32, 25, 56] and the Plurality rule [49, 14], the characterization of the Kemeny rule[6] [61], the characterization of the Antiplurality rule [8], and the characterizations of the approval voting rule[7] due to Fishburn [43] and Sertel [52]. Freeman et al. [27] proposed an axiomatic characterization of runoff methods, i.e., methods that proceed in multiple rounds and in each round eliminate a subset of candidates (the single transferable vote (STV) rule, a rule used, e.g., in Australia, is perhaps the best known example of such a multistage elimination rule). Still, in terms of axiomatic properties, single-winner scoring rules appear to be the best understood single-winner rules. Some of their axiomatic characterizations were proposed by Gärdenfors [28], Smith [56] and Young [60] (we refer the reader to the survey of Chebotarev and Shamis [13] for an overview of these characterizations). For a number of voting rules no axiomatic characterizations are yet known.

Probabilistic single-winner election rules have also been a subject of axiomatic studies. For instance, Gibbard [30] investigated strategyproofness of probabilistic election systems and blue his result can be seen as an axiomatic characterization of the random dictatorship rule. Brandl et al. [10], by studying different types of consistency of probabilistic single-winner election rules, characterized the function returning maximal lotteries, first proposed by Fishburn [26].

The state of research on axiomatic characterizations of multiwinner voting rules is far less advanced. Indeed, we are aware of only one unconditional characterization of a multiwinner rule: Debord has characterized the k-Borda rule as the only rule that satisfies neutrality, faithfulness, consistency, and the cancellation property [16]. Yet, there exists an interesting line of research, where the properties of multiwinner election rules are studied. A large bulk of this literature focuses on the principle of Condorcet consistency [7, 33, 24, 48], and on approval-based multiwinner rules [35, 36, 6, 5]. Properties of other types of multiwinner election rules have been studied by Felsenthal and Maoz [21], Elkind et al. [17], and—in a somewhat different context—Skowron [53].

[4] Under the dictatorial voting rule, the winner is the candidate most preferred by a certain fixed voter (the dictator).

[5] The majority rule is defined for the set of two candidates only. It selects the one out of two candidates that is preferred by the majority of the voters.

[6] The Kemeny rule, given the set of rankings over the alternatives, returns a ranking that minimizes the sum of the Kendall tau [34] distances to the rankings provided by the voters.

[7] In the approval rule, each voter expresses his or her preferences by providing a set of approved candidates. A candidate that was approved by most voters is announced as the winner.

In their effort to analyze axiomatic properties of multiwinner rules, Elkind et al. [17] introduced the notion of committee scoring rules, the main focus of the current work. Committee scoring rules were later studied axiomatically and algorithmically by Faliszewski et al. [19, 20]. In particular, they have identified many interesting subclasses of committee scoring rules and found that most committee scoring rules are NP-hard to compute, but in many cases there are good approximation algorithms (the work on the complexity of committee scoring rules can be traced to the studies of the complexity of the Chamberlin–Courant rule, initiated by Procaccia, Rosenschein and Zohar [46] and continued by Lu and Boutilier [38], Betzler et al. [9], and Skowron et al. [55]). The axiomatic part of the works of Faliszewski et al. [19, 20], has lead, in particular, to characterizations of several multiwinner voting rules within the class of committee scoring rules. They showed that SNTV is the only nontrivial weakly separable representation-focused rule, Bloc is the only nontrivial weakly separable top-k-counting rule, and the k-approval-based Chamberlin–Courant rule is the only nontrivial representation-focused and top-k-counting rule.[8] (For brevity, we omit exact description of these properties here and point the readers to the original papers.)

Skowron et al. [54] has studied a family of multiwinner rules that are based on utility values of the alternatives instead of preference orders, and where these utilities are aggregated using ordered weighted average operators (OWA operators) of Yager [58]. (The same class, but for approval-based utilities, first appeared in early works of the Danish polymath Thorvald N. Thiele [57] and was later studied by Forest Simmons[9] and Aziz et al. [6, 5]). It is easy to express these OWA-based rules as committee scoring rules.

As we mentioned in the introduction, the decision rules—studied in Section 5.1—can be seen as generalizations of majority relations in the case of single-winner elections. In the world of single-winner elections, majority relations are often seen as inputs to election procedures (known as tournament solution concepts). For example, according to the Copeland method [15] the candidate with the greatest number of victories in pairwise comparisons with other candidates is a winner. The Smith set [56] is another example of such a rule: it returns the minimal (in terms of inclusion) subset of candidates, such that each member of the set is preferred by the majority of voters over each candidate outside the set. Fishburn [23] describes nine other tournament solution concepts that explore the Condorcet principle for majority graphs. For an overview of tournament solution concepts we refer the reader to the book of Laslier [37] (and to the chapter of Brandt, Brill, and Harrenstein [11] for a more computational perspective). We believe that it would be a fascinating topic of research to explore the properties (computational or axiomatic) of the generalized tournament solutions for multiwinner rules generated by our decision rules.

Intransitive preference relations have also been studied by Rubinstein [50] and by Nitzan and Rubinstein [42]. Rubinstein [50] shows axiomatic characterization of scoring systems among rules which take input preferences in the form of tournaments, i.e., complete, assymetric (possibly intransitive) relations. Nitzan and Rubinstein [42], on the other hand, provide axiomatic characterization

[8] These characterizations are, in a sense, syntactic, because the properties they rely on describe syntactic features of committee scoring functions. Faliszewski et al. [19, 20] also provide some semantic characterizations. For example, within the class of committee scoring rules, a rule is weakly separable if and only if it is non-crossing monotone and, if a rule is fixed-majority consistent, then it is top-k-counting. In effect, they characterize the Bloc rule as a committee scoring rule that is non-crossing monotone and fixed-majority consistent.

[9] See the description in the overview of Kilgour [35].

of the Borda rule, assuming each voter can have intransitive preferences.

3 Multiwinner Voting and Decision Rules

In this section we provide necessary background regarding multiwinner elections and committee scoring rules, as well as a definition of our novel concept of decision rules. For each positive integer t, by $[t]$ we mean the set $\{1, \ldots, t\}$, and by $[t]_k$ we mean the set of all k-element subsets of $[t]$. For each set X and each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by $S_k(X)$ we denote the set of all k-element subsets of X (so, in particular, we have that $S_k([t]) = [t]_k$). For a given set X, by $\Pi_>(X)$ and $\Pi_\geq(X)$ we denote the set of all linear orders over X and the set of all weak orders over X, respectively.

3.1 Multiwinner Elections

Let $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$ be the set of all the candidates, and let $N = \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ be the set of all possible voters. We refer to the members of $S_k(A)$ as size-k committees, or, simply, as committees, when k is clear from the context. For each finite subset $V \subseteq N$, by $\mathcal{P}(V)$ we denote the set of all $|V|$-element tuples of elements from $\Pi_>(A)$, indexed by elements of V. We refer to elements of $\mathcal{P}(V)$ as preference profiles for the set of voters V. We set $\mathcal{P} = \{P \in \mathcal{P}(V) : V \text{ is a finite subset of } N\}$ to be the set of all possible preference profiles. For each preference profile $P \in \mathcal{P}$, by $\mathrm{Vot}(P)$ we denote the set of all the voters in P (in particular, we have that for each $P \in \mathcal{P}(V)$ it holds that $\mathrm{Vot}(P) = V$). For each profile P and each voter $v \in \mathrm{Vot}(P)$, by $P(v)$ we denote the preference order of v in P.

Our proof approach crucially relies on using what we call *k-decision rules*. A *k-decision rule* f_k,

$$f_k : \mathcal{P} \to \Big(S_k(A) \times S_k(A) \to \{-1, 0, 1\}\Big),$$

is a function that for each preference profile $P \in \mathcal{P}$ provides a mapping, $f_k(P) \colon S_k(A) \times S_k(A) \to \{-1, 0, 1\}$, such that for each two size-k committees C_1 and C_2 it holds that $f_k(P)(C_1, C_2) = -f_k(P)(C_2, C_1)$. We interpret $f_k(P)(C_1, C_2) = 1$ as saying that at profile P the society prefers committee C_1 over committee C_2 and we denote this as $C_1 \succ_P C_2$ (we omit f_k from this notation because it will always be clear from the context). Similarly, we interpret $f_k(P)(C_1, C_2) = 0$ as saying that at profile P the society views the committees as equally good (denoted $C_1 =_P C_2$) and $f_k(P)(C_1, C_2) = -1$ as saying that at profile P the society prefers C_2 to C_1 (denoted $C_2 \succ_P C_1$). We write $C_1 \succeq_P C_2$ if $C_1 \succ_P C_2$ or $C_1 =_P C_2$, which is equivalent to $f_k(P)(C_1, C_2) \geq 0$. Sometimes, when P is a more involved expression, we write $C_1 \succeq [P]\, C_2$ instead of $C_1 \succeq_P C_2$ and $C_1 =[P]\, C_2$ instead of $C_1 =_P C_2$. By $C_1 \prec_P C_2$ we mean $C_2 \succ_P C_1$, and by $C_1 \preceq_P C_2$ we mean $C_2 \succeq_P C_1$.

A *k-winner election rule* f_k is a k-decision rule that additionally satisfies the transitivity requirement, i.e., it is a k-decision rule such that for each profile P and each three committees C_1, C_2, and C_3 of size k it satisfies the following condition:

$$C_1 \succeq_P C_2 \text{ and } C_2 \succeq_P C_3 \implies C_1 \succeq_P C_3.$$

A multiwinner election rule f is a family $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of k-winner election rules, with one k-winner rule for each committee size k. We remark that often multiwinner rules are defined to simply return the

set of winning committees, whereas in our case they implicitly define weak orders over all possible committees of a given size. Since the number of such committees is huge, we believe that giving a concise algorithm for comparing committees—this is what a transitive decision rule is—is the right way to define a multiwinner analog of a social welfare function.

3.2 Committee Scoring Rules and Decision Scoring Rules

Committee Scoring Rules For a preference order $\pi \in \Pi_{>}(A)$, by $\mathrm{pos}_\pi(a)$ we denote the position of candidate a in π (the top-ranked candidate has position 1 and the bottom-ranked candidate has position m). A single-winner scoring function $\gamma\colon [m] \to \mathbb{R}$ assigns a number of points to each position in a preference order so that $\gamma(i) \geq \gamma(i+1)$ for all $i \in [m-1]$. For example, the Borda scoring function, $\beta\colon [m] \to \mathbb{N}$, is defined as $\beta(i) = m - i$. Similarly, for each $t \in [m]$, we define the t-Approval scoring function, α_t, so that $\alpha_t(i) = 1$ for $i \leq t$ and $\alpha_t(i) = 0$ otherwise. 1-Approval scoring function is known as the plurality scoring function.

We extend the notion of a position of a candidate to the case of committees in the following way. For a preference order $\pi \in \Pi_{>}(A)$ and a committee $C \in S_k(A)$, by $\mathrm{pos}_\pi(C)$ we mean the set $\mathrm{pos}_\pi(C) = \{\mathrm{pos}_\pi(a) : a \in C\}$. By a *committee scoring function for committees of size k*, we mean a function $\lambda\colon [m]_k \to \mathbb{R}$, that for each element of $[m]_k$, interpreted as a position of a committee in some vote, assigns a score. A committee scoring function must also satisfy the following dominance requirement. Let I and J be two sets from $[m]_k$ (i.e., two possible committee positions) such that $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$, $J = \{j_1, \ldots, j_k\}$ with $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$ and $j_1 < \cdots < j_k$. We say that I dominates J if for each $t \in [k]$ we have $i_t \leq j_t$ (note that this notion might be referred to as "weak dominance" as well, since a set dominates itself). If I dominates J, then we require that $\lambda(I) \geq \lambda(J)$. For each set of voters $V \subseteq N$ and each preference profile $P \in \mathcal{P}(V)$, by $\mathrm{score}_\lambda(C, P)$ we denote the total score that the voters from V assign to committee C. Formally, we have that $\mathrm{score}_\lambda(C, P) = \sum_{v \in \mathrm{Vot}(P)} \lambda(\mathrm{pos}_{P(v)}(C))$. By a *committee scoring function* we mean a family of committee scoring functions, one for each possible size of the committee.

Definition 1 (Committee scoring rules)**.** *A multiwinner election rule is a* committee scoring rule *if there exists a committee scoring function λ such that for each two equal-size committees C_1 and C_2, we have that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$ if and only if $\mathrm{score}_\lambda(C_1, P) > \mathrm{score}_\lambda(C_2, P)$, and $C_1 =_P C_2$ if and only if $\mathrm{score}_\lambda(C_1, P) = \mathrm{score}_\lambda(C_2, P)$.*

Committee scoring rules were introduced by Elkind et al. [17] and were later studied by Faliszewski et al. [20, 19] (closely related notions were considered by Thiele [57], Skowron et al. [54] and by Aziz et al. [5, 6]). Below we present some examples of committee scoring rules by specifying the actions of the corresponding committee scoring functions on $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ with $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$:

1. The single non-transferable vote (SNTV) rule uses scoring function $\lambda_{\mathrm{SNTV}}(I) = \sum_{t=1}^{k} \alpha_1(i_t)$. In other words, for a given voter it assigns score 1 to every committee that contains her highest-ranked candidate, and it assigns score zero otherwise. That is, SNTV selects the committee of k candidates with the highest plurality scores.

2. The Bloc rule uses function $\lambda_{\mathrm{Bloc}}(I) = \sum_{t=1}^{k} \alpha_k(i_t)$, i.e., the score a committee gets from a single vote is the number of committee members positioned among the top k candidates in

this vote. Bloc selects the committee with the highest total score accumulated from all the voters (and one can see that it selects k candidates with the highest k-Approval scores).

3. The k-Borda rule uses function $\lambda_{k\text{-Borda}}(I) = \sum_{t=1}^{k} \beta(i_t)$, i.e., the score a committee gets from a single vote is the sum of the Borda scores of the committee members. It selects the committee with the highest total score (and one can see that this committee consists of k candidates with the highest Borda scores).

4. The classical Chamberlin–Courant rule [12] is defined through the scoring function $\lambda_{\beta\text{-CC}}(I) = \beta(i_1)$ (recall that we assumed that $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$). Intuitively, under the Chamberlin–Courant rule the highest-ranked member of a committee is treated as the representative for the given voter, and this voter assigns the score to the committee equal to the Borda score of his or her representative.

5. The t-Approval-Based Proportional Approval Voting rule [57, 35, 5, 6, 54] (the α_t-PAV rule, for short) is defined by the scoring function $\lambda_{\alpha_t\text{-PAV}}(I) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{j}\alpha_t(i_j)$. Thus, the score that a voter v assigns to a committee C increases (almost) logarithmically with the number of members of S located among the top t preferred candidates by v. The use of logarithmic function, implemented by the sequence of harmonic weights $(1, 1/2, 1/3, \ldots)$ ensures some interesting properties pertaining to proportional representation of the voters [5], and allows one to view α_t-PAV as an extension of the d'Hondt method of apportionment [47] to the setting where voters can vote for individual candidates rather than for parties [45].

Naturally, many other rules can be interpreted as committee scoring rules; Faliszewski et al. [20, 19] provide specific examples.

Decision Scoring Rules *Decision scoring rules* are our main example of k-decision rules. These rules are similar to committee scoring rules, but with the difference that the scores of two committees cannot be computed independently. Specifically, for each pair of committee positions (I_1, I_2) we define a numerical value, the score that a voter assigns to the pair of committees (C_1, C_2) under the condition that C_1 and C_2 stand in this voter's preference order on positions I_1 and I_2, respectively. If the total score of a pair of committees (C_1, C_2) is positive, then C_1 is preferred over C_2; if it is negative, then C_2 is preferred over C_1; if it is equal to zero, then C_1 and C_2 are seen by this decision rule as equally good.

Definition 2 (Decision scoring rules)**.** *Let $d\colon [m]_k \times [m]_k \to \mathbb{R}$ be a* decision scoring function*, that is, a function that for each pair of committee positions (I_1, I_2), where $I_1, I_2 \in [m]_k$, returns a score value (possibly negative), such that for each I_1 and I_2, it holds that $d(I_1, I_2) = -d(I_2, I_1)$. For each preference profile $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and for each pair of committees (C_1, C_2), we define the score:*

$$\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P) = \sum_{v \in \text{Vot}(P)} d(\text{pos}_{P(v)}(C_1), \text{pos}_{P(v)}(C_2)). \tag{1}$$

A k-decision rule is a decision scoring rule *if there exists a decision scoring function d such that for each preference profile P and each two committees C_1 and C_2 it holds that: (i) $C_1 \succeq_P C_2$ if and only if $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P) \geq 0$, and (ii) $C_1 =_P C_2$ if and only if $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P) = 0$.*

As we have indicated throughout the introduction and the related work discussion, one of the arguments in favor of decision scoring rules is that they generalize the notion of a majority relation: For committee size $k = 1$ we define $d_{\text{maj}}(\{i_1\}, \{i_2\}) = 1$ if $i_1 < i_2$ and $d_{\text{maj}}(\{i_1\}, \{i_2\}) = -1$ if $i_1 > i_2$. A candidate x is preferred to candidate y if and only if more voters place x ahead of y than the other way around. Naturally, each committee scoring rule is an example of (a transitive) decision scoring rules as well.

4 Axioms for Our Characterization

In this section we describe the axioms that we use in our characterization of committee scoring rules. The properties expressed by these axioms are natural, straightforward generalizations of the respective properties from the world of single-winner elections. We formulate them for the case of k-decision rules (for a given value of k), but since k-winner rules are a type of k-decision rules, the properties apply to k-winner rules as well. For each of our properties $\mathfrak{P}$, we say that a multiwinner election rule $f = \{f_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $\mathfrak{P}$ if f_k satisfies $\mathfrak{P}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We start by recalling the definitions of anonymity and neutrality, these two properties ensure that the election is fair to all voters and all candidates. Anonymity means that none of the voters is neither privileged nor discriminated against, whereas neutrality says the same for the candidates.

Definition 3 (Anonymity)**.** *We say that a k-decision rule f_k is* anonymous *if for each two (not necessarily different) sets of voters $V, V' \subseteq N$ such that $|V| = |V'|$, for each bijection $\rho\colon V \to V'$ and for each two preference profiles $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}(V)$ and $P_2 \in \mathcal{P}(V')$ such that $P_1(v) = P_2(\rho(v))$ for each $v \in V$, it holds that $f_k(P_1) = f_k(P_2)$.*

Let σ be a permutation of the set of candidates A. For a committee C, by $\sigma(C)$ we mean the committee $\{\sigma(c)\colon c \in C\}$. For a linear order $\pi \in \Pi_{>}(A)$, by $\sigma(\pi)$ we denote the linear order such that for each two candidates a and b we have $a \; \pi \; b \iff \sigma(a) \; \sigma(\pi) \; \sigma(b)$. For a given k-decision rule f_k and profile P, by $\sigma(f_k(P))$ we mean the function such that for each two size-k committees C_1 and C_2 it holds that $\sigma(f_k(P))(\sigma(C_1), \sigma(C_2) = f_k(P)(C_1, C_2)$.

Definition 4 (Neutrality)**.** *A k-decision rule f_k is* neutral *if for each permutation σ of A and each two preference profiles P_1, P_2 over the same set of voters V, such that $P_1(v) = \sigma(P_2(v))$ for each $v \in V$, it holds that $f_k(P_1) = \sigma(f_k(P_2))$.*

A rule that is anonymous and neutral is called *symmetric*. We note that our definition of anonymity resembles the ones used by Young [60] or Merlin [41] rather than the traditional ones, as presented by May [40] or Arrow [1]. The difference comes from the fact that we (just like Young and Merlin) need to consider elections with variable sets of voters. The next axiom, in particular, describes a situation where two elections with disjoint sets of voters are merged. Given two profiles P and P' over the same set of alternatives and with disjoint sets of voters, by $P + P'$ we denote the profile that consists of all the voters from P and P' with their respective preferences.

Definition 5 (Consistency)**.** *A k-decision rule f_k is* consistent *if for each two profiles P and P' over disjoint sets of voters, $V \subset N$ and $V' \subset N$, and each two committees $C_1, C_2 \in S_k(A)$, (i) if $C_1 \succ_P C_2$*

and $C_1 \succeq_{P'} C_2$*, then it holds that* $C_1 \succ_{P+P'} C_2$*, and (ii) if* $C_1 \succeq_P C_2$ *and* $C_1 \succeq_{P'} C_2$*, then it holds that* $C_1 \succeq_{P+P'} C_2$*.*

In some sense, consistency is the most essential element of Young's characterization, that distinguishes single-winner scoring rules from the other single-winner rules. In particular, it means that the rule treats small electorates in the same way as it treats large ones.

In the framework of social welfare functions (and our decision rules are analogues of those) it is important to distinguish consistency and reinforcement axioms. If we were to express the reinforcement axiom in our language, it would be worded in the same way as the consistency axiom, except that the conclusion would only apply to profiles P and P' such that $f_k(P) = f_k(P')$ (i.e., when the entire rankings produced by the rule for profiles P and P' coincide). On the other hand, the premise of consistency requires only that $f_k(P)$ and $f_k(P')$ agree on the ranking of C and C' which is a much weaker requirement than $f_k(P) = f_k(P')$. As a result, the consistency axiom is much stronger than the reinforcement axiom. For example, Kemeny's social welfare function satisfies reinforcement but not consistency. (We point the reader to the work of Young and Levenglick for an axiomatic characterization of the Kemeny's rule [61] using the reinforcement axiom.)

Remark 1. *In our proofs, we often use the consistency axiom in the following way. Let* C_1 *and* C_2 *be two committees and let* P *and* Q *be two profiles over disjoint voter sets, such that* $C_1 \succ_{P+Q} C_2$ *and* $C_1 =_P C_2$*. Using consistency, we conclude that* $C_1 \succ_Q C_2$*. Indeed, if, for example, it were the case that* $C_2 \succeq_Q C_1$ *then by consistency (as applied to merging profiles* P *and* Q*) we would have to conclude that* $C_2 \succeq_{P+Q} C_1$ *which is the opposite to what is assumed.*

The next axiom concerns the dominance relation between committee positions and specifies a basic monotonicity condition (it can also be viewed as a form of Pareto dominance).

Definition 6 (Committee Dominance)**.** *A* k*-decision rule* f_k *has the committee dominance property if for every profile* P *and every two committees* $C_1, C_2 \in S_k(A)$ *the following holds: If for every vote* $v \in \mathrm{Vot}(P)$ *we have that* $\mathrm{pos}_{P(v)}(C_1)$ *dominates* $\mathrm{pos}_{P(v)}(C_2)$*, then* $C_1 \succeq_P C_2$*.*

The definition of committee scoring rules requires that if λ is a committee scoring function (for committee size k) and I and J are two committee positions such that I dominates J, then $\lambda(I) \geq \lambda(J)$. That is, committee scoring rules have the committee dominance property by definition and, thus, we include this axiom in our characterization. Young [60] did not include axioms of this form because he allowed scoring functions to assign lower scores to higher positions.

Finally, we define the continuity property, which ensures that if a certain set of voters V prefers C_1 over C_2, then for each set of voters V', disjoint from V, there exists some (possibly large) number n, such that if we clone V exactly n times and add such a profile to V', then in this final profile C_1 will be preferred to C_2 (note that when we speak of cloning voters, we implicitly assume that the decision rule is anonymous and that the identities of the cloned voters do not matter). Thus, continuity might be viewed as a kind of "large enough majority always gets its choice" principle.

Definition 7 (Continuity)**.** *An anonymous* k*-decision rule* f_k *is* continuous *if for each two committees* $C_1, C_2 \in S_k(A)$ *and each two profiles* P_1 *and* P_2 *where* $C_1 \succ_{P_2} C_2$*, there exists a number* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for the profile* $Q = P_1 + nP_2$ *(that consists of the profile* P_1 *and of* n *copies of the profile* P_2*), it holds that* $C_1 \succ_Q C_2$*.*

Although we call this axiom continuity (after Young), we note that there are many axioms of this nature in decision theory, where they are called "Archimedean." Such axioms usually rule out the existence of parameters which are infinitely more important than some other parameters; mathematically, this is usually expressed in terms of rules that use lexicographic orders (see, for example, axiom A3 in the work of Gilboa, Schmeidler, and Wakker [31] on Case-Based Decision Theory). In Young's characterization the continuity axiom plays a similar role. For more discussion on continuity, we refer the reader to the original work of Young [60].

5 Proofs of Main Results

We now start proving our main results—the axiomatic characterizations of committee scoring rules and of decision scoring rules, i.e., Theorems A and B. In fact, Theorem B will be proved first and will serve as an intermediate step in proving Theorem A. Here is the roadmap of the proof.

Since anonymity allows us to ignore the order of linear orders in profiles, in Section 5.1 we change the domain of our rules from the set of preference profiles to the set of voting situations. A voting situation is an $m!$-dimensional vector with non-negative integers specifying how many times each linear order representing a vote repeats in the voters' preferences. We use this new representation of the domain of decision rules in Section 5.1 and we conclude this section by proving Theorem B.

In Section 5.2 we further extend the domain of our rules to generalized voting situations, allowing fractional and negative multiplicities of linear orders; the voting situations in such extended domain can then be identified with the elements of $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$. We use characterization from Section 5.1 to prove that for each symmetric, consistent, committee-dominant, continuous k-winner election rule f_k and each two committees of size k the set of voting situations for which C_1 and C_2 are equivalent is a hyperplane in $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$. This will be an important technical tool in the subsequent proof. In particular, this observation will be used in Lemma 7 which implies that for the proof of Theorem A it would be sufficient to find a committee scoring rule that correctly identifies the voting situations for which given committees are equivalent under f_k.

In Sections 5.3 and 5.4 we then concentrate solely on proving Theorem A. In Section 5.3, we prove Theorem A for the case where f is used to recognize in which profiles a certain committee C_1 is preferred over some other committee C_2, when $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k - 1$. If $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k - 1$ then there are only two candidates, let us refer to them as c_1 and c_2, such that $C_1 = (C_1 \cap C_2) \cup \{c_1\}$, and $C_2 = (C_1 \cap C_2) \cup \{c_2\}$. Thus, this case closely resembles the single-winner setting, studied by Young [60] and Merlin [41]. For each two candidates c_1 and c_2, Young and Merlin present a basis of the vector space of preference profiles that satisfies the following two properties:

(i) For each preference profile in the basis, the scores of c_1 and c_2 are equal according to every possible scoring function.

(ii) Candidates c_1 and c_2 are "symmetric" and, thus, every neutral and anonymous voting rule has to judge them as equally good.

These observations allow one to use geometric arguments to note that the set of profiles in which c_1 is preferred over c_2 can be separated from the set of profiles in which c_2 is preferred over c_1 by a hy-

perplane. The coefficients of the linear equation that specifies this hyperplane define a single-winner scoring rule, and this scoring rule is exactly the voting rule that one started with. In Section 5.3 we use the same geometric arguments, but the construction of the appropriate basis is more sophisticated. Indeed, finding this basis is the core technical part of Section 5.3.

In Section 5.4 we extend the result from Section 5.3 to the case of any two committees (irrespective of the size of their intersection), concluding the proof. Here, finding an appropriate basis seems even harder and, consequently, we use a different technique. To deal with committees C_1 and C_2 that have fewer than $k-1$ elements in common, we form a third committee, C_3, whose intersections with C_1 and C_2 have more elements than the intersection of C_1 and C_2. Then, using an inductive argument, we conclude that the space of profiles P where $C_1 =_P C_3$ is $(m! - 1)$-dimensional, and that the same holds for the space of profiles P such that $C_2 =_P C_3$. An intersection of two vector spaces with this dimension has dimension at least $m! - 2$ and, so, we have a subspace of profiles P such that $C_1 =_P C_2$ whose dimension is at least $(m-2)!$. Using combinatorial arguments, we find a profile P' which does not belong to the space but for which $C_1 =_{P'} C_2$ still holds. This gives us our $(m-1)!$-dimensional space. By applying results from the first part of the proof, this suffices to conclude that the committee scoring function that we found in Section 5.3 for committees that differ in at most one element works for all other committees as well.

5.1 Characterization of Decision Rules

We start our analysis by considering k-decision rules. Recall that the outcomes of k-decision rules do not need to be transitive. That is, for a k-decision rule f_k it is possible to have a profile P and three committees such that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$, $C_2 \succ_P C_3$, and $C_3 \succ_P C_1$. The remaining part of this section is devoted to proving Theorem B.

The whole discussion, i.e., this and the following sections, is divided into small subsections, each with a title describing its main outcome. These section titles are intended to help the reader navigate through the proof, but otherwise one can read the text as a continuous piece. In particular, all the notations, conventions, and definitions carry over from one subsection to the next, and so on.

Setting up the Framework. Let us fix, for the rest of the proof, a positive integer k, the size of the committee to be elected, and a symmetric, consistent, continuous k-decision rule f_k. Our immediate goal is to show that this rule must be a decision scoring rule. For this, we need to find a function $d\colon [m]_k \times [m]_k \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for each profile P and each two committees C_1, C_2 it holds that $C_1 \succeq_P C_2$ if and only if $\mathrm{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P) \geq 0$.

Our function d will be piecewise-defined. For each $s \in [k]$ we will define a function d_s which applies only to pairs $(I_1, I_2) \in [m]_k \times [m]_k$ satisfying $|I_1 \cap I_2| = s$, outputs real values and such that the score:

$$\mathrm{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P) = \sum_{v \in \mathrm{Vot}(P)} d_s(\mathrm{pos}_{P(v)}(C_1), \mathrm{pos}_{P(v)}(C_2)) \tag{2}$$

calculated with the use of this function satisfies the following condition: if $|C_1 \cap C_2| = s$, then $C_1 \succeq_P C_2$ if and only if $\mathrm{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P) \geq 0$. Pursuing this idea, for the rest of the proof we will

fix s and restrict ourselves to pairs of committees satisfying $|C_1 \cap C_2| = s$. The restriction of f_k to such pairs of committees will be denoted $f_{k,s}$.

The First Domain Change. Anonymity of f_k allows us to use a more convenient domain for representing preference profiles. Indeed, under anonymity the order of votes in any profile is no longer meaningful and the outcome of any symmetric rule is fully determined by the *voting situation* that specifies how many times each linear order repeats in a given profile. In particular, for any $\pi \in \Pi_>(A)$ and voting situation P, by $P(\pi)$ we mean the number of voters in P with preference order π. Fixing some order on possible votes from $\Pi_>(A)$, a voting situation can, thus, be viewed as an $m!$-dimensional vector with non-negative integer coefficients.

Correspondingly, we can view f_k as a function:

$$f_k : \mathbb{N}^{m!} \to (S_k(A) \times S_k(A) \to \{-1, 0, 1\}),$$

with the domain $\mathbb{N}^{m!}$ instead of $\mathcal{P}$ (recall the definition of a k-decision rule in Section 3.1). Representing profiles by voting situations will be helpful in our further analysis, since algebraic operations on vectors from $\mathbb{N}^{m!}$ become meaningful: for a voting situation P and a constant $c \in \mathbb{N}$, cP is the voting situation that corresponds to P in which each vote was replicated c times. Similarly, for two voting situations P and Q, the sum $P + Q$ is the voting situation obtained by merging P and Q. Subtraction of voting situations can sometimes be meaningful as well.

Given a voting situation P, when we speak of "some vote v in P," we mean "some preference order that occurs within P." We sometimes treat each vote v (i.e., each preference order) as a standalone voting situation that contains this vote only. When we say that we modify some vote within some voting situation P, we mean modifying only one copy of this vote, and not all the votes that have the same preference order.

Let $d' : [m]_k \times [m]_k \to \mathbb{R}$ be some decision scoring function. Naturally, we can speak of applying the corresponding decision scoring rule to voting situations instead of applying them to preference profiles as in (1). For a voting situation $P \in \mathcal{P}$, the score of a committee pair (C_1, C_2) is:

$$\text{score}_{d'}(C_1, C_2, P) = \sum_{v \in \Pi_>(A)} P(v) \cdot d'(\text{pos}_v(C_1), \text{pos}_v(C_2)). \tag{3}$$

Independence of Committee Comparisons from Irrelevant Swaps. We will now show that for each two committees C_1 and C_2, the result of their comparison according to f_k depends only on the positions on which C_1 and C_2 are ranked by the voters (and do not depend on the positions of candidates not belonging to $C_1 \cup C_2$). In particular, if a committee C_1 is better than committee C_2 in some election, then it will also be better after we permute the set of candidates in some of the votes but without changing the positions of committees C_1 and C_2 in these votes.

For $v \in \Pi_>(A)$, we write $v[a \leftrightarrow b]$ to denote the vote obtained from v by swapping candidates a and b. Further, if v is a vote in P, by $P[v, a \leftrightarrow b]$ we denote the voting situation obtained from P by swapping a and b in v, and by $P[a \leftrightarrow b]$ we denote the voting situation obtained from P by swapping a and b in every vote.

Lemma 1. *Let C_1 and C_2 be two size-k committees, P be a voting situation, a, b be two candidates such that one of the following conditions is satisfied: (i) $a, b \notin C_1 \cup C_2$, (ii) $a, b \in C_1 \cap C_2$, (iii) $a, b \in C_1 \setminus C_2$, or (iv) $a, b \in C_2 \setminus C_1$. Then for each vote v in P, $C_1 \geq_P C_2$ if and only if $C_1 \geq_{P[v,a\leftrightarrow b]} C_2$.*

Proof. Let us assume that $C_1 \geq_P C_2$. Our goal is to show that $C_1 \geq_{P[v,a\leftrightarrow b]} C_2$, so for the sake of contradiction we assume that $C_2 \succ_{P[v,a\leftrightarrow b]} C_1$ holds.

We rename the candidates so that $C_1 \setminus C_2 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_\ell\}$ and $C_2 \setminus C_1 = \{b_1, \ldots, b_\ell\}$, and we define σ to be a permutation (over the set of candidates) that for each $x \in [\ell]$ swaps a_x with b_x, but leaves all the other candidates intact. That is, $\sigma(a_i) = b_i$ and $\sigma(b_i) = a_i$ for all $i \in [\ell]$, and for each candidate $c \notin \{a_1, \ldots, a_\ell, b_1, \ldots, b_\ell\}$ it holds that $\sigma(c) = c$. Since $C_1 \geq_P C_2$, by neutrality we have that $C_2 \geq_{\sigma(P)} C_1$. Due to our assumptions, it holds that $C_2 \succ_{P[v,a\leftrightarrow b]} C_1$ and, by consistency,

$$C_2 \succ [\sigma(P) + P[v, a \leftrightarrow b]]\, C_1. \tag{4}$$

Let $Q = v[a \leftrightarrow b] + \sigma(v)$ be a voting situation that consists just of two votes, $v[a \leftrightarrow b]$ and $\sigma(v)$. We observe that $\sigma(P) - \sigma(v) = \sigma(P[v, a \leftrightarrow b] - v[a \leftrightarrow b])$. This is because $P[v, a \leftrightarrow b] - v[a \leftrightarrow b]$ is the same as $P - v$. Since:

$$\sigma(P) + P[v, a \leftrightarrow b] - Q \;=\; \underbrace{(\sigma(P) - \sigma(v))}_{R'} \;+\; \underbrace{(P[v, a \leftrightarrow b] - v[a \leftrightarrow b])}_{R''},$$

and both summands on the right-hand-side are symmetric with respect to σ (i.e., $\sigma(R') = R''$, $\sigma(R'') = R'$, and σ^2 is an identity permutation), by symmetry of f_k we have:

$$C_2 = [\sigma(P) + P[v, a \leftrightarrow b] - Q]\, C_1. \tag{5}$$

Thus, by consistency—as applied to equations (4) and (5) in the way described in Remark 1—we get that $C_2 \succ_Q C_1$. By neutrality, we also infer that $C_2 \succ_{Q[a\leftrightarrow b]} C_1$. This follows because for each of the four conditions for a, b from the statement of the lemma it holds that permutation $a \leftrightarrow b$ maps committee C_1 to committee C_1 and committee C_2 to committee C_2. Next, by consistency we get that $C_2 \succ_{[Q+Q[a\leftrightarrow b]]} C_1$. However, we observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} Q + Q[a \leftrightarrow b] &= \Big(v[a \leftrightarrow b] + \sigma(v)\Big) + \Big(v + \sigma(v)[a \leftrightarrow b]\Big) \\ &= \underbrace{\Big(v[a \leftrightarrow b] + \sigma(v)[a \leftrightarrow b]\Big)}_{Q'} + \underbrace{\Big(v + \sigma(v)\Big)}_{Q''}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if $a, b \notin C_1 \cup C_2$, or $a, b \in C_1 \cap C_2$, then $\sigma(v)[a \leftrightarrow b] = \sigma(v[a \leftrightarrow b])$. On the other hand, if $a, b \in C_1 \setminus C_2$ or $a, b \in C_2 \setminus C_1$, then $\sigma(v)[a \leftrightarrow b] = (\sigma \circ [a \leftrightarrow b])(v[a \leftrightarrow b])$. In other words, there always exists a permutation τ such that $Q' = \tau(Q')$, $C_1 = \tau(C_2)$, and $C_2 = \tau(C_1)$ (τ is either σ or $\sigma \circ [a \leftrightarrow b]$), and, similarly, we have $Q'' = \sigma(Q'')$, $C_2 = \sigma(C_1)$, $C_1 = \sigma(C_2)$. Thus, by neutrality, we get that:

$$C_2 = [v[a \leftrightarrow b] + \sigma(v[a \leftrightarrow b])]\, C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 = [v + \sigma(v)]\, C_1.$$

Thus, by consistency, we infer that $C_2 =_{[Q+Q[a\leftrightarrow b]]} C_1$, which contradicts our previous conclusion. This completes the proof. □

Putting the Focus on Two Fixed Committees. Recall that we have assumed f_k to be symmetric, consistent and continuous. Now, we fix a pair of size-k committees, C_1 and C_2 with $|C_1 \cap C_2| = s$, and define f_{C_1,C_2} to be the rule that acts on voting situations in the same way as $f_{k,s}$ does, but with the difference that it only distinguishes, at any voting situation P, whether (i) C_1 is preferred over C_2, or (ii) C_1 and C_2 are seen as equally good, or (iii) C_2 is preferred over C_1. In other words, we set $f_{C_1,C_2}(P)$ to be -1, 0 or 1 depending on $f_{k,s}(P)$ ranking C_1 lower than, equally to, or higher than C_2, respectively ($f_{k,s}$ can be viewed as the collection of rules $f_{C'_1,C'_2}$, one for each possible pair of committees C'_1 and C'_2).

Defining Distinguished Profiles. For each two committee positions I_1 and I_2 such that $|I_1 \cap I_2| = |C_1 \cap C_2| = s$, we consider a single-vote voting situation $v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)$, where C_1 and C_2 are ranked on positions I_1 and I_2, respectively, and all the other candidates are ranked arbitrarily, but in some fixed, predetermined order.

Let us consider two cases. First, let us assume that for each two committee positions I_1 and I_2 such that $|I_1 \cap I_2| = s$, it holds that C_1 is as good as C_2 relative to $v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)$, i.e., $C_1 =[v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)]\, C_2$. By Lemma 1, we infer that for each single-vote voting situation v we have $C_1 =_v C_2$ (because in any vote the set of positions shared by C_1 and C_2 always has the same cardinality s). Further, by consistency, we conclude that f_{C_1,C_2} is trivial, i.e., for every voting situation P it holds that $C_1 =_P C_2$. By neutrality, we get that $f_{k,s}$ is also trivial (i.e., it declares equally good each two committees whose intersection has s candidates). Of course, in this case $f_{k,s}$ is a decision scoring rule (with trivial scoring function $d_s(I_1, I_2) \equiv 0$).

If the above case does not hold, then there are some two committee positions, I_1^* and I_2^*, such that $|I_1^* \cap I_2^*| = s$ and C_1 is not equivalent to C_2 relative to $v(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)$. Without loss of generality we assume that:

$$C_1 \succ [v(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)]\, C_2. \tag{6}$$

We note that, by neutrality, this implies:

$$C_2 \succ [v(C_2 \to I_1^*, C_1 \to I_2^*)]\, C_1. \tag{7}$$

Let us fix any two such I_1^* and I_2^* for now. As we will see throughout the proof, any choice of I_1^* and I_2^* with the aforementioned property will suffice for our arguments.

For each two committee positions I_1 and I_2 with $|I_1 \cap I_2| = |I_1^* \cap I_2^*| = s$, and for each two nonnegative integers x and y, we define the following voting situation:

$$P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)} = y \cdot (v(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)) + x \cdot (v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)),$$

where there are y voters that rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^*, respectively, and there are x voters that rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1 and I_2, respectively.

Deriving the Components for the Decision Scoring Function for f_{C_1,C_2}. We now proceed toward defining a decision scoring function for $f_{k,s}$. To this end, we define the value Δ_{I_1,I_2} as:

$$\Delta_{I_1,I_2} = \begin{cases} \sup\left\{\frac{y}{x} \colon C_2 \succ \left[P^{y(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right] C_1, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{N}\right\} & \text{for } C_1 \succ [v(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)]\, C_2, \\ -\inf\left\{\frac{y}{x} \colon C_2 \succ \left[P^{y(C_1\to I_2^*, C_2\to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right] C_1, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{N}\right\} & \text{for } C_2 \succ [v(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)]\, C_1, \\ 0 & \text{for } C_1 = [v(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)]\, C_2. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

This definition certainly might not seem intuitive at first. However, we will show that the values Δ_{I_1,I_2}, for all possible I_1 and I_2 with $|I_1 \cap I_2| = s$, in essence, define a decision scoring function for $f_{k,s}$. The next few lemmas should build an intuition for the nature of these values. However, let us first argue that the values Δ_{I_1,I_2} are well defined. Let us fix some committee positions I_1 and I_2 (such that $|I_1 \cap I_2| = |I_1^* \cap I_2^*| = s$). Due to continuity of f_k, we see that the appropriate sets in Equation (8) are non-empty. For example, if $C_1 \succ [v(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)]\, C_2$ and, thus, $C_2 \succ [v(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)]\, C_1$, then continuity of f_k ensures that there exists (possibly large) x such that $C_2 \succ \left[P^{(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right] C_1$. This proves that the set from the first condition of (8) is nonempty. An analogous reasoning proves the same fact for the set from the second condition in (8). Further, we claim that the value Δ_{I_1,I_2} is finite. This is evident for the case where we take the infimum over the set of positive rational numbers. For the case where we take the supremum, this follows from Lemma 2, below.

Lemma 2. *For each two committee positions I_1 and I_2 with $|I_1 \cap I_2| = s$, it holds that $\Delta_{I_2,I_1} = -\Delta_{I_1,I_2}$.*

Proof. We assume, without loss of generality, that $C_1 \succ [v(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)]\, C_2$.[10] Let us consider two sets:

$$U = \left\{\frac{y}{x} \colon C_2 \succ \left[P^{y(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right] C_1, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{N}\right\}$$

(U is the set that we take supremum of in Equation (8)), and:

$$L = \left\{\frac{y}{x} \colon C_2 \succ \left[P^{y(C_1\to I_2^*, C_2\to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)}\right] C_1, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{N}\right\}$$

(thus, L is the set that we take infimum of in Equation (8), for Δ_{I_2,I_1}). We will show that $\sup U = \inf L$. First, we show that $\sup U \leq \inf L$. For the sake of contradiction, let us assume that this is not the case, i.e., that there exists $\frac{y}{x} \in U$ and $\frac{y'}{x'} \in L$ such that $\frac{y}{x} > \frac{y'}{x'}$. Since $\frac{y}{x} \in U$ and $\frac{y'}{x'} \in L$, we get:

$$C_2 \succ \left[P^{y(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right] C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 \succ \left[P^{y'(C_1\to I_2^*, C_2\to I_1^*)}_{x'(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)}\right] C_1.$$

Let us consider the voting situation:

$$S = y' \cdot P^{y(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)} + y \cdot P^{y'(C_1\to I_2^*, C_2\to I_1^*)}_{x'(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)}.$$

[10] This assumption is without loss of generality because the condition from the statement of the lemma, $\Delta_{I_2,I_1} = -\Delta_{I_1,I_2}$, is symmetric; if it held that $C_2 \succ [v(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)]\, C_1$ then we could simply swap I_2 and I_1, and we would prove that $\Delta_{I_1,I_2} = -\Delta_{I_2,I_1}$.

By consistency, we have that $C_2 \succ_S C_1$. However, let us count the number of voters in S that rank committees C_1 and C_2 on particular positions. There are yy' voters that rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^*, respectively, and the same number yy' of voters that rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2^* and I_1^*. Due to neutrality and consistency, these voters cancel each other out. (Formally, if S' were a voting situation limited to these voters only, we would have $C_1 =_{S'} C_2$. This is so due to the symmetry of f_k and the fact that for any permutation σ that swaps all the members of $C_1 \setminus C_2$ with all the members of $C_2 \setminus C_1$, we have $S' = \sigma(S')$.) Next, there are $x'y$ voters that rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1, and I_2, and xy' of voters that rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2 and I_1, respectively. Since we assumed that $\frac{y}{x} > \frac{y'}{x'}$, we have that $x'y > xy'$. So, xy' voters from each of the two aforementioned groups cancel each other out (in the same sense as above), and we are left with considering $x'y - xy' > 0$ voters that rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1 and I_2. Thus, we conclude that $C_1 \succ_S C_2$. However, this contradicts the fact that $C_2 \succ_S C_1$ and we conclude that $\sup U \leq \inf L$.

Next, we show that $\sup U \geq \inf L$. To this end, we will show that there are no values $\frac{y}{x}$ and $\frac{y'}{x'}$ such that $\sup U < \frac{y}{x} < \frac{y'}{x'} < \inf L$. Assume on the contrary that this is not the case and that such values exist. It must be the case that $\frac{y}{x}$ is not in U and, so, we have:

$$C_1 \geq \left[P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}\right] C_2. \tag{9}$$

Since $\frac{y}{x}$ also cannot be in L, we have:

$$C_1 \geq \left[P^{y(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)}\right] C_2. \tag{10}$$

By neutrality (applied to (10), and any permutation σ that swaps candidates from $C_1 \setminus C_2$ with those from $C_2 \setminus C_1$), we have that:

$$C_2 \geq \left[P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}\right] C_1. \tag{11}$$

By putting together Equations (9) and (11), and by noting that the same reasoning can be repeated for $\frac{y'}{x'}$ instead of $\frac{y}{x}$, we conclude that it must be the case that:

$$C_1 = \left[P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}\right] C_2 \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 = \left[P^{y'(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x'(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}\right] C_2. \tag{12}$$

After applying neutrality to the first voting situation in (12) (and copying the second part of (12)) we obtain:

$$C_1 = \left[P^{y(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)}\right] C_2 \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 = \left[P^{y'(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x'(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}\right] C_2. \tag{13}$$

We now define voting situation:

$$Q = x' \cdot P^{y(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)} + x \cdot P^{y'(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x'(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}.$$

From Equation (13) (and consistency), we get that $C_1 =_Q C_2$. In Q there is the same number of voters who rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1 and I_2 as those that rank them on positions I_2 and I_1, respectively (so these voters cancel each other out). On the other hand, there are yx' voters who rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2^* and I_1^*, and $y'x$ voters who rank these committees on positions I_1^* and I_2^*,

respectively. Since $yx' < y'x$, we get that $C_1 \succ_Q C_2$, which contradicts our earlier observation that $C_1 =_Q C_2$. We conclude that it must be the case that $\sup U \geq \inf L$.

Finally, since we have shown that $\sup U \leq \inf L$ and $\sup U \geq \inf L$, we have that $\sup U = \inf L$. This proves that $\Delta_{I_2,I_1} = -\Delta_{I_1,I_2}$. □

The next lemma shows that Δ_{I_1,I_2} provides a threshold value for proportions of voters in distinguished profiles with respect to the relation between C_1 and C_2.

Lemma 3. *Let I_1 and I_2 be two committee positions such that $|I_1 \cap I_2| = s$, and let x, y be two positive integers. The following two implications hold:*

1. *if $C_1 \succ[v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)]\ C_2$ and $\frac{y}{x} < \Delta_{I_1,I_2}$, then $C_2 \succ\left[P^{y(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right] C_1$,*
2. *if $C_2 \succ[v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)]\ C_1$ and $\frac{y}{x} > -\Delta_{I_1,I_2}$, then $C_2 \succ\left[P^{y(C_1\to I_2^*, C_2\to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right] C_1$.*

Proof. Let us start with proving the first implication. Assume that $C_1 \succ[v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)]\ C_2$, and, for the sake of contradiction, that:

$$C_1 \succeq \left[P^{y(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right]\ C_2. \tag{14}$$

It follows from the definition of Δ_{I_1,I_2} that there exist two numbers $x', y' \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\frac{y}{x} < \frac{y'}{x'} \leq \Delta_{I_1,I_2}$ and:

$$C_2 \succ \left[P^{y'(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x'(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}\right]\ C_1. \tag{15}$$

Let us consider a voting situation that is obtained from $P^{y(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}$ (i.e., from the voting situation that appears in (14)) by swapping positions of C_1 and C_2, i.e., let us consider voting situation $P^{y(C_1\to I_2^*, C_2\to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)}$. Naturally, in such a voting situation C_2 is weakly preferred over C_1:

$$C_2 \succeq \left[P^{y(C_1\to I_2^*, C_2\to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)}\right]\ C_1. \tag{16}$$

By Equations (16), (15), and consistency of f_k, we observe that in the voting situation:

$$P = x' \cdot P^{y(C_1\to I_2^*, C_2\to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1\to I_1, C_2\to I_2)} + x \cdot P^{y'(C_1\to I_1^*, C_2\to I_2^*)}_{x'(C_1\to I_2, C_2\to I_1)}$$

committee C_2 is strictly preferred over C_1 (i.e., $C_2 \succ_P C_1$). Let us now count the voters in P. There are xx' of them who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1 and I_2, respectively, and there are xx' voters who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2 and I_1, respectively. By the same arguments as used in the proof of Lemma 2, these voters cancel each other out. Next, there are $y'x$ voters who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^*, respectively, and $x'y$ voters who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2^* and I_1^*, respectively. Since $y'x > yx'$. we conclude that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$ (again, using the same reasoning as we used in Lemma 2 for similar arguments). This is a contradiction with our earlier observation that $C_2 \succ_P C_1$. This completes the proof of the first part of the lemma.

The proof of the second implication is similar and we provide it for the sake of completeness. We assume that $C_2 \succ [v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)]\ C_1$ and, for the sake of contradiction, that:

$$C_1 \succeq \left[P^{y(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}\right]\ C_2. \tag{17}$$

From the definition of Δ_{I_1,I_2} we know that there must be two numbers $x', y' \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\frac{y}{x} > \frac{y'}{x'} \geq -\Delta_{I_1,I_2}$ and:

$$C_2 \succ [P^{y'(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}_{x'(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}]\ C_1. \tag{18}$$

If we swap the positions of committees C_1 and C_2 in the voting situation used in Equation (17), then by neutrality we have that:

$$C_2 \succeq \left[P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)}\right]\ C_1 \tag{19}$$

We now form voting situation:

$$Q = x' \cdot P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)} + x \cdot P^{y'(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}_{x'(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)}$$

By Equations (19), (18), and consistency of f_k we have that $C_2 \succ_Q C_1$. However, counting voters again leads to a contradiction. Indeed, we have xx' voters who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1 and I_2, respectively, and xx' voters who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2 and I_1, respectively. These voters cancel each other out. Then we have $y'x$ voters who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2^* and I_1^*, respectively, and we have $x'y$ voters who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^*, respectively. Since $y'x < x'y$, we have that $C_1 \succ_Q C_2$, which is a contradiction with our previous conclusion that $C_2 \succ_Q C_1$. This proves the second part of the lemma. □

Putting Together the Decision Scoring Function for f_{C_1,C_2}. We are ready to define a decision scoring function d_s for f_{C_1,C_2}. For any two committee positions I_1 and I_2, with $|I_1 \cap I_2| = s$, we set:

$$d_s(I_1, I_2) = \Delta_{I_1,I_2}.$$

We note that our d_s formally depends on the choice of I_1^* and I_2^*, however this is not a problem. We simple need a decision scoring function that behaves correctly and each choice of I_1^* and I_2^* would give us one. Intuitively, we can think of $d_s(I_1, I_2)$ as an (oriented) distance between I_1 and I_2. The next lemma shows that we treat the distance between I_1^* and I_2^* as a sort of gauge to measure distances between other positions.

Lemma 4. *It holds that* $\Delta_{I_1^*,I_2^*} = 1$.

Proof. We note that for each positive integer z, we have $C_1 = [P^{z(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{z(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}]\ C_2$. Further, due to consistency of f_k (used as in Remark 1) and by the choice of I_1^* and I_2^* (recall Equations (6) and (7)), we observe that $C_1 \succ [P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}]\ C_2$ whenever $y > x$ and $C_2 \succ [P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}]\ C_1$ whenever $y < x$. We conclude that $\Delta_{I_1^*,I_2^*} = \sup\left\{\frac{y}{x} : y < x, \text{ for } x, y \in \mathbb{N}_+\right\} = 1$. □

The next lemma shows that d_s is a decision scoring function for f_{C_1,C_2}. Based on this result, we will later argue that it works for all pairs of committees, not only for (C_1, C_2), and hence that it is a decision scoring function for $f_{k,s}$.

Lemma 5. *Let C_1, C_2 and d_s be as defined in the above discussion. Then for each voting situation P the following three implications hold: (i) if* $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P) > 0$, *then $C_1 \succ_P C_2$; (ii) if* $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P) = 0$, *then $C_1 =_P C_2$; (iii) if* $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P) < 0$, *then $C_2 \succ_P C_1$.*

Proof. We start by proving (i). Let P be a voting situation such that $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P) > 0$. For the sake of contradiction we assume that $C_2 \succeq_P C_1$.

The idea of the proof is to perform a sequence of transformations of P so that the result according to f_k does not change (due to the imposed axioms), but, eventually, in the resulting profile each voter puts committees C_1 and C_2 either on positions I_1^*, I_2^* or the other way round. Let t be the total number of transformations that we perform to achieve this and let P_i be the voting situation that we obtain after the i-th transformation. We will ensure that for each voting situation P_i it holds that $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P_i) > 0$ and $C_2 \succeq_{P_i} C_1$. In particular, for the final voting situation P_t we will have $C_2 \succeq_{P_t} C_1$, $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P_t) > 0$, and each voter will have committees C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^* or the other way round. Therefore, we will have:

$$P_t = x(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*) + y(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)$$

for some nonnegative integers x and y, and by Lemmas 2 and 4 we will have:

$$\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P_t) = x d_s(I_1^*, I_2^*) + y d_s(I_2^*, I_1^*) = x - y$$

However, from $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P_t) > 0$ we will conclude that $x > y$, i.e., there must be more voters who put C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^* than on positions I_2^* and I_1^*. By our choice of I_1^* and I_2^* (recall Equation (6) as in the proof of Lemma 4) we will conclude that $C_1 \succ_{P_t} C_2$. This will be a contradiction with $C_2 \succeq_{P_t} C_1$.

We now describe the transformations. We set $P_0 = P$. We perform the i-th transformation in the following way. If for each voter in P_{i-1}, committees C_1 and C_2 stand on positions I_1^* and I_2^* (or the other way round), we finish our sequence of transformations. Otherwise, we take a preference order of an arbitrary voter from P_{i-1}, for whom the set of committee positions of C_1 and C_2 is not $\{I_1^*, I_2^*\}$. Let us denote this voter by v_i. Let z denote the number of voters in P_{i-1} who rank C_1 and C_2 on the same positions as v_i, including v_i (so $z \geq 1$). Let I_1 and I_2 denote the positions of the committees C_1 and C_2 in the preference order of v_i, respectively. Let $\epsilon = \text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P_{i-1})/2z > 0$.

Case 1: If $C_1 =[v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)]\, C_2$, then we obtain P_i by removing from P_{i-1} all z voters with the same preference order as v_i. By consistency of f_k, it follows that in the resulting voting situation P_i it still holds that $C_2 \succeq_{P_i} C_1$ (this is, in essence, the same canceling out of voters that we already used in Lemmas 2 and 3). Also, by definition of Δ_{I_1,I_2} in Equation (8), we have $\Delta_{I_1,I_2} = 0$. Hence, it still holds that $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P_i) > 0$.

Case 2: If $C_1 \succ[v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)]\ C_2$, then let x and y be such integers that $\Delta_{I_1,I_2} - \epsilon < \frac{y}{x} < \Delta_{I_1,I_2}$ (recall that ϵ is defined just above Case 1, and that z is the number of voters with the same preference order as v_i). We define two new voting situations:

$$R_{i-1} = z \cdot P^{y(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{i-1} = x \cdot P_{i-1} + R_{i-1}.$$

From Lemma 3 it follows that $C_2 \succ_{R_{i-1}} C_1$ and, by consistency, we get that $C_2 \succ_{Q_{i-1}} C_1$. Let us now calculate $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, R_{i-1})$. We note that R_{i-1} consists of zx voters who rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2 and I_1 (and who contribute $zx\Delta_{I_2,I_1} = -zx\Delta_{I_1,I_2}$ to the value of $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, R_{i-1})$) and of zy voters who rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^*, respectively (who contribute value $zy\Delta_{I_1^*,I_2^*} = zy$). That is, we have $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, R_{i-1}) = -zx\Delta_{I_1,I_2} + zy$. Further, by definition of ϵ, we have that $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P_{i-1}) = 2z\epsilon$. In consequence, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, Q_{i-1}) &= x \cdot \text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P_{i-1}) + \text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, R_{i-1}) \\ &= 2zx\epsilon + (-zx\Delta_{I_1,I_2} + zy) \\ &= 2zx\epsilon + zx(-\Delta_{I_1,I_2} + \frac{y}{x}) \geq 2zx\epsilon - zx\epsilon > 0.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality (in the final row) follows from the fact that we assumed $\Delta_{I_1,I_2} - \epsilon < \frac{y}{x} < \Delta_{I_1,I_2}$. We now move on to Case 3, where we also build voting situation Q_{i-1} with a similar property, and then describe how to obtain P_i from Q_{i-1}'s.

Case 3: If $C_2 \succ[v(C_1 \to I_1, C_2 \to I_2)]\ C_1$, then our reasoning is very similar to that from Case 2. Let x and y be such integers that $-\Delta_{I_1,I_2} < \frac{y}{x} < -\Delta_{I_1,I_2} + \epsilon$. We define two voting situations

$$R_{i-1} = z \cdot P^{y(C_1 \to I_2^*, C_2 \to I_1^*)}_{x(C_1 \to I_2, C_2 \to I_1)} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{i-1} = x \cdot P_{i-1} + R_{i-1}.$$

Lemma 3 implies that $C_2 \succ_{R_{i-1}} C_1$, and, thus, from consistency, we get that $C_2 \succ_{Q_{i-1}} C_1$. Further, using similar analysis as in Case 2, we get that:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, Q_{i-1}) &= x \cdot \text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P_{i-1}) + zx\Delta_{I_2,I_1} - zy \\ &= 2zx\epsilon + zx(-\Delta_{I_1,I_2} - \frac{y}{x}) \geq 2zx\epsilon - zx\epsilon > 0.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality (in the final row) follows from the assumption that $-\Delta_{I_1,I_2} < \frac{y}{x} < -\Delta_{I_1,I_2} + \epsilon$. Below we describe how to obtain P_i from Q_{i-1} (for both Cases 2 and 3).

In Cases 2 and 3, in the voting situation Q_{i-1} exactly zx voters have C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2 and I_1, respectively (for both cases, these voters are introduced in voting situation R_{i-1}). Further, there are exactly zx voters who rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1 and I_2, respectively (these are the cloned-x-times voters that were originally in P_{i-1}). We define P_i as Q_{i-1} with these $2zx$ voters removed. Since we removed the same number of voters who rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_2 and I_1, respectively, as the number of voters who rank these committees on positions I_1 and I_2, respectively, we conclude that $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P_i) = \text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, Q_{i-1}) > 0$ and that $C_2 \succeq_{P_i} C_1$.

We note that after the just-described transformation none of the voters has both C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1 and I_2, respectively, and that we only added a number of voters that rank C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^* (or the other way round) or we cloned voters already present. Hence, if we perform such transformations for all possible pairs of committee positions I_1 and I_2, we will obtain our final voting situation, P_t, for which it holds that the following three conditions are satisfied: (i) $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P_t) > 0$, (ii) $C_2 \geq_{P_t} C_1$, and (iii) in P_t each voter ranks C_1 and C_2 on positions I_1^* and I_2^* (or the other way round). Given (i) and (iii) we conclude that in P_t there are more votes in which C_1 stands on position I_1^* and C_2 stands on position I_2^* than there are voters where the opposite holds. However, this implies that $C_1 \succ_{P_t} C_2$ and contradicts the fact that $C_2 \geq_{P_t} C_1$. This completes the proof of the first part of the lemma.

Next, we consider part (ii) of the theorem. Let P be some voting situation such that $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P) = 0$. For the sake of contradiction we assume that $C_2 \neq_P C_1$, and, without loss of generality, we assume that $C_2 \succ_P C_1$. Since for the voting situation $v(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)$ it holds that $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, v(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*)) > 0$, then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, in the voting situation

$$Q_n = nP + v(C_1 \to I_1^*, C_2 \to I_2^*),$$

we have $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, Q_n) > 0$, and—from part (i) of the theorem—we get that $C_1 \succ_{Q_n} C_2$. On the other hand, continuity requires that there exists some value of n such that $C_2 \succ_{Q_n} C_1$.

To prove part (iii) of the theorem, it suffices to observe that if $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P) < 0$, then $\text{score}_{d_s}(C_2, C_1, P) = -\text{score}_{d_s}(C_1, C_2, P) > 0$ and use part (i) of the theorem to conclude that in such case we have $C_2 \succ_P C_1$. This gives a contradiction and completes the proof. □

Completing the Proof of Theorem B. We have dealt with a fixed pair of committees (C_1, C_2) and we have proven Lemma 5 which justifies that d_s is a decision scoring function for f_{C_1,C_2}. From neutrality it follows that d_s will give us a decision scoring function for $f_{k,s}$. However, as we noted at the beginning of this section, f_k can be viewed as a collection of independent functions $f_{k,s}$ for $s \in \{0 \dots k-1\}$, thus this observation is sufficient to prove Theorem B, a Young-Style characterization of decision scoring rules.

5.2 The Tools to Deal with Committee Scoring Rules

We have proved Theorem B, which will serve as a useful tool for proving Theorem A. However, to complete the proof of Theorem A we still need to derive one more technical tool—Lemma 7 below—that applies the results obtained so far to committee scoring rules. To achieve this goal, we need to change our domain from $\mathbb{N}^{m!}$ to $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$, and before we make this change, we need to introduce several new notions. (While the correctness of our first domain change relied on the decision rule being symmetric, this second domain change, similarly to the case considered by Young [60], uses our further axioms.)

We distinguish one specific voting situation, $e = \langle 1, 1, \dots, 1 \rangle$, called the *null profile*, describing the setting where each possible vote is cast exactly once. It immediately follows that under each symmetric k-decision rule f_k, each two committees are ranked equally in e, i.e., for each two committees C_1, C_2 we have $C_1 =_e C_2$.

Definition 8 (Independence of Symmetric Profiles)**.** *A symmetric k-decision rule f_k is* independent of symmetric profiles *if for every voting situation $P \in \mathbb{N}^{m!}$ and for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $f_k(P + \ell e) = f_k(P)$.*

Definition 9 (Homogeneity)**.** *A symmetric k-decision rule f_k is* homogeneous *if for every voting situation $P \in \mathbb{N}^{m!}$ and for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $f_k(\ell P) = f_k(P)$.*

Intuitively, independence of symmetric profiles says that if we add one copy of each possible vote then they will all cancel each other out. Homogeneity says that the result of an election depends only on the relative proportions of the linear orders in the voting situation and not on the exact numbers of linear orders. One can verify that each symmetric and consistent k-decision rule satisfies both independence of symmetric profiles and homogeneity (indeed, the requirement in the definition of homogeneity is a special case of the requirement from the definition of consistency).[11]

Second Domain Change. Now we are ready to extend our domain from $\mathbb{N}^{m!}$ to $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$. To this end, we use the following result. It was originally stated for single-winner rules but it can be adapted to the multiwinner setting in a straightforward way.

Lemma 6 (Young [60], Merlin [41])**.** *Suppose a k-decision rule $f_k \colon \mathbb{N}^{m!} \to (S_k(A) \times S_k(A) \to \{-1, 0, 1\})$ is symmetric, independent of symmetric profiles and homogeneous. There exists a unique extension of f_k to the domain $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$ (which we also denote by f_k), satisfying for each positive $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, and $P \in \mathbb{N}^{m!}$ the following two conditions:*

1. $f_k(P - \ell e) = f_k(P)$,
2. $f_k\left(\frac{P}{\ell}\right) = f_k(P)$.

Lemma 6 allows us to consider voting situations with fractional numbers of linear orders. From now on, when we speak of voting situations, we mean voting situations from our new domain, $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$. We note that within our new domain, the score of a pair (C_1, C_2) of committees relative to a voting situation P under decision scoring function d can still be expressed as in Equation (3). Indeed, for decision scoring rules, this definition gives the unique extension that Lemma 6 speaks of. Thus Theorem B extends to decision rules with domain $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$.

Constructing a Tool for Committee Scoring Rules. Since $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$ is a vector space over the field of rational numbers, from Theorem B (extended to $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$) we infer that for each two committees C_1 and C_2, the space of voting situations P such that $C_1 =_P C_2$ is a hyperplane in the $m!$-dimensional vector space of all voting situations. This is so, because if we treat a voting situation P as a vector of $m!$ variables, then condition $\text{score}_d(C_1, C_2, P) = 0$ turns out to be a single linear equation. Hence, the space of voting situations P such that $C_1 =_P C_2$ is a hyperplane in $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$ and has dimension $m! - 1$. This can be summarized as the following corollary.

[11]The reader may ask why do we introduce independence of symmetric profiles and homogeneity, when what we require from them already follows from consistency. The reason is that, we believe, these two properties better explain—on the intuitive level—why the second domain change is allowed.

Corollary 1. *The set* $\{P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!} : C_1 =_P C_2\}$ *is a hyperplane in the vector space of all voting situations* $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$.

From now on, we assume that our k-decision rule f_k is transitive, that is, we require that for each voting situation P and each three committees C_1, C_2, and C_3 it holds that:

$$(C_1 \succeq_P C_2) \text{ and } (C_2 \succeq_P C_3) \text{ implies } (C_1 \succeq_P C_3).$$

In other words, from now on we require f_k to be a k-winner election rule.

Lemma 7. *Let* f_k *be a symmetric, consistent, committee-dominant, continuous k-winner election rule, and let* $\lambda : [m]_k \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a committee scoring function. If it holds that for each two committees* C_1 *and* C_2 *and each voting situation* P *it holds that the committee scores of* C_1 *and* C_2 *are equal (according to* λ*) if and only* C_1 *and* C_2 *are equivalent according to* f_k*, then it holds that: For each two committees* C_1 *and* C_2 *and each voting situation* P*, if the committee score of* C_1 *is greater than that of* C_2 *(according to* λ*) then* C_1 *is preferred over* C_2 *according to* f_k *(i.e.,* $C_1 \succ_P C_2$*).*

Proof. Based on λ, we build a decision scoring function g as follows. For each two committee positions I_1 and I_2, we have $g(I_1, I_2) = \lambda(I_1) - \lambda(I_2)$. The score of a committee pair (C_1, C_2) in voting situation P under g is given by:

$$\text{score}_g(C_1, C_2, P) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_\succ(A)} P(\pi) \cdot g(\text{pos}_\pi(C_1), \text{pos}_\pi(C_2)).$$

Let us fix $x \in [k-1]$ and two arbitrary committees C_1^* and C_2^* such that $|C_1^* \cap C_2^*| = x$. We note that, by the assumptions of the theorem, if it holds that:

$$\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) = 0 \iff C_1^* =_P C_2^*,$$

then, by Corollary 1, $H = \{P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!} : C_1^* =_P C_2^*)\}$ is an $(m! - 1)$-dimensional hyperplane. More so, this is the same hyperplane as the following two (where $d = d_x$ is the decision scoring function from the thesis of Lemma 5, built for f_k):

$$\{P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!} : \text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!} : \text{score}_d(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) = 0\},$$

We claim that for C_1^* and C_2^* one of the following conditions must hold:

1. For each voting situation P, if $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) > 0$ then $C_1^* \succ_P C_2^*$.
2. For each voting situation P, if $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) > 0$ then $C_2^* \succ_P C_1^*$.

Why is this so? For the sake of contradiction, let us assume that there exist two voting situations, P and Q, such that $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) > 0$ and $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, Q) > 0$, but $C_1^* \succeq_P C_2^*$ and $C_2^* \succeq_Q C_1^*$. From the fact that $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) > 0$ and $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, Q) > 0$, we see that the points P and Q lie on the same side of hyperplane H and neither of them lies on H. From $C_1^* \succeq_P C_2^*$, $C_2^* \succeq_Q C_1^*$, and from Lemma 5, we see that $\text{score}_d(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) \geq 0$ and $\text{score}_d(C_1^*, C_2^*, Q) \leq 0$. That is, at least

one of the voting situations P and Q lies on the hyperplane, or they both lie on different sides of the hyperplane. This gives a contradiction and proves our claim.

Now, using the committee dominance axiom, we exclude the second possibility. For each $i \in [m-k+1]$ we set $I_i = \{i, i+1, \ldots, i+k-1\}$. Let I and J denote, respectively, the best possible and the worst possible position of a committee, i.e., $I = I_1$ and $J = I_{m-k+1}$. For the sake of contradiction, let us assume that there exists a profile P', where $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P') > 0$ and $C_2^* \succ_{P'} C_1^*$. Since there exists a profile with $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P') > 0$, it must be the case that $\lambda(I) > \lambda(J)$ (otherwise λ would be a constant function). Thus there must exist p such that $\lambda(I_p) > \lambda(I_{p+k-x})$. Let us consider a profile S consisting of a single vote where C_1^* stands on position I_p and C_2^* stands on position I_{p+k-x} (as $|C_1^* \cap C_2^*| = x$, this is possible). Since $\lambda(I_p) > \lambda(I_{p+k-x})$, we have that $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, S) > 0$. By committee-dominance of f_k, it follows that $C_1^* \succeq_S C_2^*$. However, from the reasoning in the preceding paragraph (applied to profile S), we know that either $C_1^* \succ_S C_2^*$ or $C_2^* \succ_S C_1^*$. Putting these two facts together, we conclude that $C_1^* \succ_S C_2^*$. Since we have shown a single profile S such that $\text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, S) > 0$ and $C_1^* \succ_S C_2^*$, by the argument from the previous paragraph, we know that for every profile P it holds that:

$$\text{If } \text{score}_g(C_1^*, C_2^*, P) > 0 \text{ then } C_1^* \succ_P C_2^*.$$

Our choice of committees C_1^* and C_2^* was arbitrary and, thus, the above implication holds for all pairs of committees. This completes the proof. □

Due to Lemma 7, in our further discussion, given a symmetric, consistent, committee-dominant, continuous k-winner election rule f_k we can focus solely on the subspace $\{P\colon C_1 =_P C_2\}$. If we manage to show that committees C_1 and C_2 are equivalent if and only if the score of C_1 is equal to the score of C_2 according to some committee scoring function λ, then we can conclude that f_k is a committee scoring rule defined by this committee scoring function λ. This important observation concludes the first part of the proof.

5.3 Second Part of the Proof: Committees with All but One Candidate in Common

We now start the second part of the proof. The current section is independent from the results of the previous one, but we do use all the notation that was introduced and, in particular, we consider voting situations over $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$. We will use results from Sections 5.1 and 5.2 only in Section 5.4, where we conclude the whole proof.

The Setting and Our Goal. As before, the size of committees is denoted as k. Throughout this section we assume f_k to be a k-winner election rule that is symmetric, consistent, committee-dominant, and continuous. Our goal is to show that as long as we consider committees that contain some $k-1$ fixed members and can differ only in the final one, f_k acts on such committee pairs as a committee scoring rule. The discussion in this section is inspired by that of Young [60] and Merlin [41], but the main part of our analysis is original (in particular Lemma 11).

Position-Difference Function. Let P be a voting situation in $\mathbb{Q}^{m!}$, C be some size-k committee, and I be a committee position. We define the weight of position I with respect to C within P as:

$$\text{pos-weight}_I(C, P) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_>(A):\ \text{pos}_\pi(C)=I} P(\pi),$$

That is, $\text{pos-weight}_I(C, P)$ is the (rational) number of votes in which committee C is ranked on position I.

For each two committees C_1, C_2 such that $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k - 1$, we define a committee position-difference function $\alpha_{C_1,C_2} : \mathbb{Q}^{m!} \to \mathbb{Q}^{\binom{m}{k}}$ that for each voting situation $P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!}$ returns a vector of $\binom{m}{k}$ elements, indexed by committee positions (i.e., elements of $[m]_k$), such that for each committee position I, we have:

$$\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)[I] \ = \ \text{pos-weight}_I(C_1, P) - \text{pos-weight}_I(C_2, P).$$

Naturally, $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)$ is a linear function of P. We claim that for each voting situation P, we have:

$$\sum_{I \in [m]_k} \alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)[I] = 0. \tag{20}$$

To see why this is the case, we note that $\sum_{I\in[m]_k} \text{pos-weight}_I(C_1, P) = \sum_{\pi\in\Pi_>(A)} P(\pi)$ because every vote is accounted exactly once. Thus, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{I \in [m]_k} \alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)[I] &= \sum_{I \in [m]_k} \Big(\text{pos-weight}_I(C_1, P) - \text{pos-weight}_I(C_2, P)\Big) \\
&= \sum_{I \in [m]_k} \text{pos-weight}_I(C_1, P) - \sum_{J \in [m]_k} \text{pos-weight}_J(C_2, P) \\
&= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_>(A)} P(\pi) - \sum_{\pi' \in \Pi_>(A)} P(\pi') = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Position-difference functions will be important technical tools that we will soon use in the proof (in particular, in Lemma 11 we will show that if $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0\rangle$ then $C_1 =_P C_2$). However, we need to provide some more tools first.

Johnson Graphs and Hamiltonian Paths. We will need the following graph-theoretic results to build certain votes and preference profiles in our following analysis. We mention that the graphs that Lemmas 8 and 9 speak of are called Johnson graphs. Lemma 8 was known before (we found the result in the work of Asplach [4] and could not trace an earlier reference[12]), and we provide the proof for the sake of completeness.

[12]We suspect the results might have been known before the work of Asplach. Indeed, similar results appear in the form of algorithms that output all size-k subsets of a given set in the order so that each two consecutive sets differ in only one element. Yet, we need the specific variants provided in Lemmas 8 and 9 that finish the Hamiltonian path on a specific vertex. Asplach [4] does not mention directly that his proofs provide this property, but close inspection shows that this is the case.

Lemma 8. *Let p and j be integers such that $1 \leq j \leq p$. Let $G(j, p)$ be a graph constructed in the following way. We associate j-element subsets of $\{1, \ldots p\}$ with vertices and we say that two vertices are connected if the corresponding subsets differ by exactly one element (they have $j-1$ elements in common). Such a graph contains a Hamiltonian path, i.e., a path that visits each vertex exactly once, that starts from the set $\{1, \ldots, j\}$ and ends in the set $\{p-j+1, \ldots, p\}$.*

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction over j and p. For $j = 1$ and for each $p \geq 1$, it is easy to see that the required path exists (in this case, the graph is simply a full clique). This provides the induction base. For the inductive step, we assume that there are two numbers, p' and j', such that for each p and j ($j \leq p$) such that $p < p'$ and $j < j'$ it holds that graph $G(j, p)$ contains a Hamiltonian path satisfying the constraints from the lemma. We will prove that such a path also exists for $G(j', p')$.

We partition the set of vertices of $G(j', p')$ into $p' - j + 1$ groups $V(j', p', 1), \ldots, V(j', p', p' - j + 1)$, where for each $x \in \{1, \ldots, p' - j + 1\}$, group $V(j', p', x)$ consists of all sets of j elements (vertices of the graph) such that x is the lowest among them.

We build our Hamiltonian path for $G(j', p')$ as follows. We start with the vertex $\{1, \ldots, j'\}$. By our inductive hypothesis, we know that there is a path that starts with $\{1, \ldots, j'\}$, traverses all vertices in $V(j', p', 1)$, and ends in $\{1, p' - j' + 2, \ldots, p'\}$. From $\{1, p' - j' + 2, \ldots, p'\}$ we can go, over a single edge, to $\{2, p' - j' + 2, \ldots, p'\}$. Starting with this vertex, by our inductive hypothesis, we can traverse all the vertices of $V(j', p', 2)$. Then, over a single edge, we can move to some vertex from $V(j', p', 3)$, traverse all the vertices there, and so on. By repeating this procedure, we will eventually reach some vertex in the set $V(j', p', p' - j' + 1)$. However, $V(j', p', p' - j' + 1)$ contains exactly one vertex, $\{p' - j' + 1, \ldots, p'\}$. This means that we have found the desired Hamiltonian path. □

Lemma 9. *Let r, p and j be integers such that $1 \leq r \leq p$ and $1 \leq j \leq p-1$. Let $\tilde{G}(j, p, r)$ be a graph constructed in the following way: (i) A j-element subset of $\{1, \ldots, p\}$ is a vertex of $\tilde{G}(j, p, r)$ if and only if it contains at least one element smaller than r. (ii) There is an edge between two vertices if they differ in exactly one element (i.e., if they have $j-1$ elements in common). Such a graph contains a Hamiltonian path.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the previous one. We partition the set of vertices of $\tilde{G}(j, p, r)$ into $r - 1$ groups $V(j, p, 1), \ldots, V(j, p, r - 1)$, where for each $x \in \{1, \ldots, r - 1\}$, group $V(j, p, x)$ consists of all the sets (i.e., all the vertices) such that x is their smallest member.

We build our Hamiltonian path for $\tilde{G}(j, p, r)$ as follows. We start with the vertex $\{1, \ldots, j\}$. By Lemma 8, we can continue the path from $\{1, \ldots, j\}$, traverse all vertices in $V(j, p, 1)$, and end in $\{1, p - j + 2, \ldots, p\}$. From $\{1, p - j + 2, \ldots, p\}$ we can go, over a single edge, to $\{2, p - j + 2, \ldots, p\}$, and we can traverse all vertices in $V(j, p, 2)$. Then we can go, over a single edge, to some vertex from $V(j, p, 3)$, and we can continue in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 8. □

The Range of α_{C_1,C_2}. Let us consider two distinct committees C_1 and C_2. Using Lemma 8, we establish the dimension of the range of function α_{C_1,C_2}. This result will be useful in the proof of Lemma 11.

Lemma 10. *For two committees, C_1 and C_2, the range of the function α_{C_1,C_2} has dimension $\binom{m}{k} - 1$.*

Proof. From Equation (20), we get that the dimension of the range of function α_{C_1,C_2} is at most $\binom{m}{k} - 1$. Now, let us consider graph $G = G(k, m)$ from Lemma 8 and the Hamiltonian path specified in this lemma. Note that we can understand each vertex in G as a committee position. For each edge (I, I') on our Hamiltonian path, consider a single vote where C_1 stands on position I and C_2 stands on position I'. For such a vote, α_{C_1,C_2} returns a vector with all zeros except a single 1 on position I and a single -1 on position I'. It is easy to observe that there are $\binom{m}{k} - 1$ such votes and that so constructed vectors are linearly independent. □

(C_1,C_2)-Symmetric Profiles. The final tool that we need to provide before we prove Lemma 11 is the definition of (C_1, C_2)-symmetric profiles. Suppose σ is a permutation of A. Then we can extend its action to linear orders and voting situations in the natural way.

Definition 10. *Let C_1 and C_2 be two size-k committees. We say that a voting situation P is* (C_1, C_2)-symmetric *if there exists a permutation of the set of candidates σ and a sequence of committees $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_x$ such that $P = \sigma(P)$ and:*

1. *$C_1 = F_1 = F_x$ and $C_2 = F_2$,*
2. *for each $i \in [x - 1]$ it holds that $\sigma(F_i) = F_{i+1}$.*

If a voting situation P is (C_1, C_2)-symmetric then we know that $C_1 =_P C_2$. Why is this the case? For the sake of contradiction let us assume that $C_1 \neq_P C_2$, and, without loss of generality, that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$. From $C_1 \succ_P C_2$ (which translates to $F_1 \succ_P F_2$) by neutrality of f_k we infer that $F_2 \succ_{\sigma(P)} F_3$, thus that $F_2 \succ_P F_3$. By the same arguments, we get that $F_1 \succ_P F_2 \succ_P F_3 \succ_P \cdots \succ_P F_x$. In consequence, we get that $C_1 \succ_P C_1$, a contradiction.

Further, we observe that for each (C_1, C_2)-symmetric voting situation P it holds that $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0\rangle$. Indeed, if σ is as in Definition 10, we note that since $\sigma(C_1) = C_2$ and since $\sigma(P) = P$, for each (fractional) vote in P where committee C_1 stands on some position I we can uniquely assign a (fractional) vote in P where committee C_2 stands on the same position I. This shows that $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)[I]$ is a vector of non-positive numbers. By an analogous argument (using the fact that $\sigma^{(-1)}(C_2) = C_1$ and $\sigma^{(-1)}(P) = P$) we infer that $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)[I]$ is a vector of nonnegative numbers, and, so, we conclude that $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0\rangle$.

Inferring Committee Equivalence Using α_{C_1,C_2}. We are ready to present Lemma 11, our main technical tool required in this part of the proof. On the intuitive level, it says that for $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k-1$ the information provided by the function α_{C_1,C_2} in relation to a profile P is sufficient to distinguish whether C_1 is equivalent to C_2 with respect to P.

Lemma 11. *For each two committees $C_1, C_2 \in S_k(A)$ such that $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k-1$ and for each voting situation $P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!}$, if $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0\rangle$ then $C_1 =_P C_2$.*

Proof. The kernel of a linear function is the space of all vectors for which this function returns the zero vector. In particular, the kernel of α_{C_1,C_2}, denoted $\ker(\alpha_{C_1,C_2})$, is the space of all voting situations P such that $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0\rangle$. Since the domain of function α_{C_1,C_2} has dimension $m!$

and, by Lemma 10, its range has dimension $\binom{m}{k} - 1$, the kernel of α_{C_1,C_2} has dimension $m! - \binom{m}{k} + 1$. We will construct a base of this kernel that will consists of (C_1, C_2)-symmetric voting situations only. Since for each (C_1, C_2)-symmetric voting situation P it holds that $C_1 =_P C_2$ and $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0\rangle$, by consistency of f_k and linearity of α_{C_1,C_2} we will prove the conclusion of the theorem.

We prove the statement by a two-dimensional induction on k (the committee size) and m (the size of the set of candidates). As a base for the induction we will show that the property holds for $k = 1$ and all values of m. For the inductive step we will show that from the fact that the property holds for committee size $j - 1$ and for $p - 1$ candidates it follows that the property also holds for committee size j and for p candidates. This will allow us to conclude that the property holds for all values of m and k with $m \geq k$.

For $k = 1$ and for an arbitrary value of m, the problem collapses to the single-winner setting. It has been shown by Young [60] (and by Merlin [41]) that for each two candidates c_1 and c_1', there exists a base of $\ker(\alpha_{\{c_1\},\{c_1'\}})$ that consists of $m! - (m - 1)$ voting situations which are $(\{c_1\}, \{c_1'\})$-symmetric. This gives us the base for the induction.

Let us now prove the inductive step. We want to show that the statement is satisfied for $A_p = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots a_p\}$, $C_{1,j} = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_j\}$ and $C_{2,j} = \{a_1', a_2, \ldots, a_j\}$, where we set $a_1' = a_{j+1}$. (We note that since f_k is symmetric, the exact names of the candidates we use here are irrelevant, and we picked these for notational convenience.) From the sets A_p, $C_{1,j}$ and $C_{2,j}$ we take out element a_j and get $A_{p-1} = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}, a_{j+1}, \ldots a_p\}$, $C_{1,(j-1)} = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}\}$ and $C_{2,(j-1)} = \{a_1', a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}\}$. Let V_{j-1} be a base of $\ker(\alpha_{C_{1,(j-1)},C_{2,(j-1)}})$ that consists of $(C_{1,(j-1)}, C_{2,(j-1)})$-symmetric voting situations. We know that it exists from the induction hypothesis. We also know that it consists of $(p-1)! - \binom{p-1}{j-1} + 1$ voting situations. We now build the desired base for $\ker(\alpha_{C_{1,j},C_{2,j}})$ using V_{j-1} as the starting point. Our base has to consist of $p! - \binom{p}{j} + 1$ linearly independent, $(C_{1,j}, C_{2,j})$-symmetric voting situations.

First, for each voting situation $P \in V_{j-1}$ and for each $r \in \{1, \ldots p\}$ we create a voting situation P_r as follows. We take each vote v in P and we put a_j in the r-th position of v, pushing the candidates on positions $r, r + 1, r + 2, \ldots$ back by one position, but keeping their relative order unchanged. There are $p! - p\binom{p-1}{j-1} + p$ such vectors and it is easy to see that they are linearly independent. Let us refer to the set of these vectors as B_1. Naturally, the vectors from B_1 do not span the whole space $\ker(\alpha_{\{a_1,\ldots,a_j\},\{a_1',\ldots,a_j\}})$; there is simply too few of them. However, there is also a certain structural reason for this and understanding this reason will help us further in the proof. Let $\mathrm{lin}(B_1)$ denote the set of linear combinations of voting situations from B_1. For each $r \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and each $T \in \mathrm{lin}(B_1)$, let $T(a_j \to r)$ denote the voting situation that consists of all votes from T which have a_j on the r-th position. We can see that for each $r \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and each $T \in \mathrm{lin}(B_1)$, it holds that $\alpha_{C_{1,j},C_{2,j}}(T(a_j \to r)) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0\rangle$ (the reason for this is that $T(a_j \to r)$ is, in essence, a linear combination of voting situations from V_{j-1}, with a_j inserted at position r) . This property certainly does not hold for all the voting situations in $\ker(\alpha_{\{a_1,\ldots,a_j\},\{a_1',\ldots,a_j\}})$.

We now form the second part of our base, denoted B_2 and consisting of $p\binom{p-1}{j-1} \cdot \frac{j-1}{j} - (p - 1)$ voting situations ($(C_{1,j}, C_{2,j})$-symmetric and linearly independent from each other and all the voting situations in B_1). We start constructing each voting situation in B_2 by constructing its distinctive vote. To construct a distinctive vote, we first select the position for candidate a_j; we consider each

position from $\{1, \ldots, p\}$. Let us fix $r \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ as the position that we picked. Next, we select a set of j positions for the candidates from $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{j-1}, a'_1\}$. To do that, we first construct the following graph. We associate all sets of $j-1$ positions such that r is greater[13] than at least one of them with vertices (for a fixed r there are $\binom{p-1}{j-1} - \binom{p-r}{j-1}$ such vertices; we choose $j-1$ positions out of $p-1$ still available, but we omit the situations where all these $j-1$ positions are greater than r). We say that two vertices are connected if the corresponding sets differ by exactly one element. From Lemma 9 it follows that such a graph contains a Hamiltonian path. Now, for each edge (X, X') on the considered Hamiltonian path we do the following. Let $B = X \cap X'$, and let b and b' be the two elements such that $b < b'$ and $\{b, b'\} = (X \setminus B) \cup (X' \setminus B)$. (In other words, b and b' are the two elements on which X and X' differ.) Note that $|B| = j-2$. We form a distinctive vote by putting candidate a_j on position r, candidates $a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}$ on the positions from B (in some arbitrary order), a_1 on position b, a'_1 on position b', and all the other candidates on the remaining positions (in some arbitrary order).

How many distinctive votes have we constructed? There are p possible values for the position of a_j, and for each such position we consider a graph. If the position of a_j is r, then the graph has $\binom{p-1}{j-1} - \binom{p-r}{j-1}$ vertices. Thus, altogether, the number of vertices is:

$$\sum_{r=1}^{p} \left(\binom{p-1}{j-1} - \binom{p-r}{j-1} \right) = p\binom{p-1}{j-1} - \sum_{r=1}^{p} \binom{p-r}{j-1}$$
$$= p\binom{p-1}{j-1} - \binom{p}{j} = p\binom{p-1}{j-1} - \frac{p}{j}\binom{p-1}{j-1} = p\binom{p-1}{j-1}\frac{j-1}{j},$$

where the second equality follows from the following property of binomial coefficients: for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{k}{m} = \binom{n+1}{m+1}$. (An intuitive way to obtain the same result is as follows. Let us fix the value r chosen uniformly at random. The vertices for the graph for this value of r are size-$(j-1)$ subsets of $p-1$ positions, except those subsets that contain only elements greater than r. By symmetry, on the average the number of subsets that we omit is a $1/j$ fraction of all the subsets. Since we have all the graphs for all values of r, altogether we have $p\binom{p-1}{j-1}\frac{j-1}{j}$ vertices.) One of the graphs is empty (it is the one that is constructed for $r = 1$, because there is no element in $\{1, \ldots, p\}$ lower than $r = 1$). Thus we have $p-1$ non-empty graphs. As a result, the total number of edges in the considered Hamiltonian paths is $p\binom{p-1}{j-1}\frac{j-1}{j} - (p-1)$. Every edge corresponds to a distinctive vote, so this is also the number of distinctive votes constructed.

For each distinctive vote v constructed, we build the following voting situation:

Case 1. If a_1 and a'_1 are both ranked ahead of a_j, then we let τ be permutation $\tau := (a_1, a_j, a'_1)$ (i.e., we let τ be the identity permutation except that $\tau(a_1) = a_j$, $\tau(a_j) = a'_1$, $\tau(a'_1) = a_1$) and we let the voting situation consist of three votes, v, $\tau(v)$, and $\tau^{(2)}(v)$:

$$v\colon \ \cdots \succ a_1 \succ \cdots \succ a'_1 \succ \cdots \succ a_j \succ \cdots$$
$$\tau(v)\colon \ \cdots \succ a_j \succ \cdots \succ a_1 \succ \cdots \succ a'_1 \succ \cdots$$
$$\tau^{(2)}(v)\colon \ \cdots \succ a'_1 \succ \cdots \succ a_j \succ \cdots \succ a_1 \succ \cdots$$

[13]There is a possible point of confusion here. By "greater" we mean greater as a number. So, for example, position 7 is greater than position 5 (even though we would say that a candidate ranked on position 5 is ranked higher than candidate ranked on position 7).

Note that permutation τ and the sequence $F_1 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_j\}$, $F_2 = \{a_2, \ldots, a_j, a'_1\}$, $F_3 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{j-1}, a'_1\}$, $F_4 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_j\}$ witness that this voting situation is $(C_{1,j}, C_{2,j})$-symmetric.

Case 2. If it is not the case that a_1 and a'_1 are both ranked ahead of a_j in distinctive vote v, then we know that there is some other candidate $a \in \{a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}\}$ ranked ahead of a_j. This is due to our construction of distinctive votes—we always put a_j on position r and make sure that there is some candidate ranked on a position ahead of r. If all the candidates $a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}$ were ranked behind a_j, then it would have to be the case that both a_1 and a'_1 are ranked ahead of a_j.[14] Since it is not the case that both a_1 and a'_1 are ranked ahead of a_j, there must be some other candidate from $\{a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}\}$ that is. We call this candidate a. We let ρ be permutation $\rho := (a_1, a'_1)(a, a_j)$ (i.e., we let ρ be the identity permutation, except that it swaps a_1 with a'_1 and a with a_j). We form a voting situation that consists of v and $\rho(v)$:

$$v\colon \cdots \succ a \succ \cdots \succ a_j \succ \cdots \succ a_1 \succ \cdots \succ a'_1 \succ \cdots$$
$$\rho(v)\colon \cdots \succ a_j \succ \cdots \succ a \succ \cdots \succ a'_1 \succ \cdots \succ a_1 \succ \cdots$$

Permutation ρ and the sequence $F_1 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_j\}$, $F_2 = \{a_2, \ldots, a_j, a'_1\}$, $F_3 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_j\}$ witness that this is a $(C_{1,j}, C_{2,j})$-symmetric voting situation.

Let B_2 consists of all the voting situations constructed from the distinctive votes.

For each $r \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, each set of $j-1$ positions R from $\{1, \ldots, p\} \setminus \{r\}$, and each voting situation P, we define $\gamma_{r,R}(P)$ to be the total (possibly fractional) number of votes from P that have a_j on the r-th position and that have candidates from $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}\}$ on positions from R. We define $\gamma'_{r,R}(P)$ analogously, for the votes where a_j is on position r and candidates $a'_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}$ take positions from R. We define $\beta_{r,R}(P)$ to be $\gamma_{r,R}(P) - \gamma'_{r,R}(P)$. For example, for each $P \in B_1$ we have $\beta_{r,R}(P) = 0$.

Let us consider voting situations from B_2 which were created from a single Hamiltonian path in one of the graphs. The distinctive votes for all these voting situations have a_j on the same position; we denote this position by r. For each such voting situation P, each non-distinctive vote belonging to P has a_j on a position ahead of position r. Further, we see that there exist exactly two sets R_1 and R_2 such that $\beta_{r,R_1}(P) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{r,R_2}(P) \neq 0$. These are the sets that correspond to the vertices connected by the edge from which the distinctive vote for P was created (for one of them, let us say R_1, we have $\beta_{r,R_1}(P) = 1$, and for the other we have $\beta_{r,R_2}(P) = -1$; to see that this holds, recall that a_j is ranked on positions ahead of r in non-distinctive votes and, thus, it suffices to consider the distinctive vote only).

Now we are ready to explain why the vectors from $B_1 \cup B_2$ are linearly independent. For each nontrivial linear combination L of the vectors from $B_1 \cup B_2$ we will show that L cannot be equal to the zero vector. For the sake of contradiction let us assume that $L = \langle 0, \ldots, 0 \rangle$. We start by showing

[14] To see why this is the case, recall how the distinctive votes are produced. We have an edge (X, X') on a Hamiltonian path in our graph. We set $B = X \cap X'$ and $\{b, b'\} = (X \setminus B) \cup (X' \setminus B)$. B contains positions of the candidates $a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}$, whereas b and b' are positions of a_1 and a'_1. Without loss of generality, we can take $X = B \cup \{b\}$ and $X' = B \cup \{b'\}$. Since—by our assumption here—the positions of $a_2, \ldots, a_{j-1}$ (i.e., the positions in B) are greater than the position of a_j (denoted r in the description of distinctive votes construction), for X and X' to be vertices in the graph, we need both b and b' to be smaller than r (and, in effect, both a_1 and a'_1 precede a_j).

that all coefficients of vectors from B_2 in L are equal to zero. Again, for the sake of contradiction let us assume that this is not the case. Let B'_2 consist of those vectors from B_2 that appear in L with non-zero coefficients. Let r be the largest position of a_j in some vote in B'_2 (by "largest position" we mean largest numerically, i.e., for each vote v that occurs in some voting situation from B'_2 it holds that $\mathrm{pos}_v(a_j) \leq r$). Let $B'_{2,r}$ be the set of all voting situations from B'_2 that have some votes which have a_j on position r. Each voting situation in $B'_{2,r}$ consists of either two or three votes. However, the votes belonging to those voting situations which have a_j on position r must be distinctive votes (all non-distinctive votes for voting situations in B_2 have a_j on positions ahead of r). Each such distinctive vote is built from an edge of a single Hamiltonian path (they come from the same Hamiltonian path because otherwise they would not have a_j on the same position). Let S be a voting situation in $B'_{2,r}$ that has a distinctive vote built from the latest edge on the path, among the edges that contributed voting situations to $B'_{2,r}$ (to make this notion meaningful, we orient the path in one of the two possible ways). Let R_1 and R_2 be the sets of $j-1$ positions that form this edge. By the reasoning from the previous paragraph we have that $\beta_{r,R_1}(S) \neq 0$, $\beta_{r,R_2}(S) \neq 0$, and one of the following two conditions must hold (depending on the orientation of the Hamiltonian path that we chose):

1. For each voting situation Q' in B'_2 other than S we have $\beta_{r,R_1}(Q') = 0$.
2. For each voting situation Q' in B'_2 other than S we have $\beta_{r,R_2}(Q') = 0$.

Further, for each $Q \in B_1$ we have $\beta_{r,R_1}(Q) = \beta_{r,R_2}(Q) = 0$. Thus, since β_{r,R_1} and β_{r,R_2} are linear functions, we have that either $\beta_{r,R_1}(L) \neq 0$ or $\beta_{r,R_2}(L) \neq 0$. Thus, L cannot be a zero-vector, which gives a contradiction.

We have shown that all coefficients of vectors from B_2 used to form L are equal to zero. Thus L must be a linear combination of vectors from B_1. However, the vectors from B_1 are linearly independent, which means that if L is $\langle 0, \ldots, 0 \rangle$, then the coefficients of all the vectors from B_1 are zeros. Thus we conclude that the vectors from $B_1 \cup B_2$ are linearly independent.

It remains to show that $B_1 \cup B_2$ indeed forms a base of the kernel of $\alpha_{C_{1,j},C_{2,j}}$. Since vectors in B_1 and B_2 are linearly independent, it suffices to check that the cardinality of $B_1 \cup B_2$ is equal to the dimension of $\ker(\alpha_{C_{1,j},C_{2,j}})$. The number of vectors in $B_1 \cup B_2$ is equal to:

$$\underbrace{\left(p! - p\binom{p-1}{j-1} + p\right)}_{|B_1|} + \underbrace{\left(p\binom{p-1}{j-1} \cdot \frac{j-1}{j} - p + 1\right)}_{|B_2|} = p! - \frac{p}{j}\binom{p-1}{j-1} + 1 = p! - \binom{p}{j} + 1.$$

This completes our induction. The proof works for arbitrary committees C_1 and C_2 with $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k-1$ due to symmetry of f_k. □

We are almost ready to show that for committees that differ by one candidate only, f_k is a committee scoring rule, and to derive its committee scoring function. However, before we do that we need to change the domain once again. We will also need some notions from topology.

Topological Definitions. For every set S in some Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, by $\mathrm{int}(S)$ we mean the interior of S, i.e., the largest (in terms of inclusion) open set contained in S. By $\mathrm{conv}(S)$ we mean

the convex hull of S, i.e., the smallest (in terms of inclusion) convex set that contains S. Finally, by $\overline{S}$ we define the closure of S, i.e., the smallest (in terms of inclusion) closed set that contains S. We use the concept of $\mathbb{Q}$-convex sets of Young [60] and we recall his two observations.

Definition 11 ($\mathbb{Q}$-convex sets)**.** *A set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-convex if $S \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^n$ and for each $s_1, s_2 \in S$ and each $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $0 \leq q \leq 1$, it holds that $q \cdot s_1 + (1-q) \cdot s_2 \in S$.*

Lemma 12 (Young [60])**.** *Set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-convex if and only if $S = \mathbb{Q}^n \cap \mathrm{conv}(S)$.*

Lemma 13 (Young [60])**.** *If a set S is $\mathbb{Q}$-convex, then $\overline{S} = \overline{\mathrm{conv}(S)}$; moreover, $\overline{S}$ is convex.*

Third Domain Change. In the following arguments, we fix two arbitrary committees C_1 and C_2 such that $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k-1$ and focus on them. (In other words, we consider function f_{C_1,C_2} instead of f_k.) In this case, Lemma 11 allows us to change the domain of the function.

Let us consider two voting situations P and Q such that $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P) = \alpha_{C_1,C_2}(Q)$. Since α_{C_1,C_2} is a linear function, we have $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P-Q) = \langle 0, \ldots, 0 \rangle$. Thus, by Lemma 11, we know that $C_1 =_{P-Q} C_2$. We can express Q as $Q = P + (Q-P)$ and thus, by consistency of f_{C_1,C_2}, we have that:

$$C_1 \succ_P C_2 \iff C_1 \succ_Q C_2.$$

Consequently, to answer the question "what is the relation between committees C_1 and C_2 according to f_{C_1,C_2} in voting situation P?" it suffices to know the value $\alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)$. This is exactly because for any two profiles, P and Q, with the same values of function α_{C_1,C_2} the result of comparison of committees C_1 and C_2 according to f_{C_1,C_2} is the same in P and Q.

In effect, we can restrict the domain of f_{C_1,C_2} to an $\left(\binom{m}{k}-1\right)$-dimensional space D:

$$D = \left\{ P \in \mathbb{Q}^{\binom{m}{k}} : \sum_{I \in [m]_k} P[I] = 0 \right\}.$$

We interpret elements of D as the values of the committee position-difference function α_{C_1,C_2} and, so, the condition $\sum_{I \in [m]_k} P[I] = 0$ corresponds to the property of committee position-difference functions given in Equation (20). By the argument given prior to the definition of D, we know that from the point of view of comparing committees C_1 and C_2 using function f_{C_1,C_2}, the vector of values α_{C_1,C_2} provides the same information as a voting situation from which it is obtained. Thus, we can think of elements of D as corresponding to voting situations.

Separating Two Committees. We proceed by defining two sets, $D_1, D_2 \subseteq D$, such that:

$$D_1 = \{P \in D : C_1 \succ_P C_2\} \quad \text{and} \quad D_2 = \{P \in D : C_2 \succ_P C_1\}.$$

That is, D_1 corresponds to situations where, according to f_{C_1,C_2}, committee C_1 is preferred over C_2, and D_2 corresponds to the situations where it is the other way round. From consistency of f_{C_1,C_2}, it follows that D_1 and D_2 are $\mathbb{Q}$-convex.

Let us consider the case where f_{C_1,C_2} is trivial, i.e., for each voting situation it ranks C_1 and C_2 as equal. By neutrality, it follows that f_k ranks equally each two committees C_1' and C_2', such that $|C_1' \cap C_2'| = k-1$. This means that f_k (for committees with intersection $k-1$) can be expressed by means of the trivial committee scoring function $\lambda \equiv 0$. So let us assume that f_{C_1,C_2} is nontrivial and there is some voting situation where it does not rank C_1 and C_2 equally. In this case one of the sets D_1 and D_2 is nonempty. From neutrality it follows that so is the other one. Now, we move our analysis from $\mathbb{Q}^{\binom{m}{k}}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{m}{k}}$, by analyzing the closures of the sets D_1 and D_2.

Lemma 14. *The sets* $\text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ *and* $\overline{D_2}$ *are disjoint, convex, and nonempty relative to* D *(i.e.,* $\text{int}(\overline{D_1}) \cap D \neq \emptyset$ *and* $\overline{D_2} \cap D \neq \emptyset$*).*

Proof. This lemma follows from the results given by Young [60] and Merlin [41]. However, in their cases the proofs are implicit in the text. We include an explicit proof for the sake of completeness.

From Lemma 13, it follows that the sets $\overline{D_1}$ and $\overline{D_2}$ are convex and, thus, the interior $\text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ is also convex. Now, we prove that $\overline{D_1} \cup \overline{D_2} = \overline{D}$, a fact that will be useful in our further analysis. If this is not the case, then $\overline{D} - (\overline{D_1} \cup \overline{D_2})$ is open in $\overline{D}$. Thus, there exists a point P and an $\left(\binom{m}{k}-1\right)$-dimensional ball $\mathcal{B}$ such that $P \in \mathcal{B} \subseteq \overline{D} - (\overline{D_1} \cup \overline{D_2})$. Naturally, $C_1 =_P C_2$. Thus, for some $S \in D_1$, there exists a (small) $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, such that $Q = x \cdot S + (1-x) \cdot P$ belongs to the ball $\mathcal{B}$. Since Q belongs to $\mathcal{B}$, it must be the case that $C_1 =_Q C_2$. However, by consistency of f_{C_1,C_2}, we have that $C_1 \succ_Q C_2$ and, so, we have $Q \in D_1$. This is a contradiction.

Next, we show that the set $\text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ is nonempty, relatively to D. For the sake of contradiction, assume that $\text{int}(\overline{D_1}) \cap D = \emptyset$. Then, from neutrality, it follows that also $\text{int}(\overline{D_2}) \cap D = \emptyset$. Thus, D_1 and D_2 are nowhere dense in D,[15] and so are $\overline{D_1}$, $\overline{D_2}$, and $\overline{D_1} \cup \overline{D_2} = \overline{D}$. Consequently, we get that $\overline{D}$ is nowhere dense in D, a contradiction with the density of D in $\overline{D}$[16] (density of D follows immediately from its definition).

To see that $\overline{D_2} \cap D$ is nonempty, it suffices to note that f_k is nontrivial (by assumptions just ahead of the statement of the lemma) and, so, D_2 is nonempty. Since D_2 is a subset of both $\overline{D_2}$ and D, we get that $\overline{D_2} \cap D \neq \emptyset$.

Now we show that $\text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ and D_2 are disjoint. For the sake of contradiction, let us assume that there exists $P \in \overline{D}$, such that $P \in \text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ and $P \in D_2$. From Lemma 13, we get that $\text{int}(\overline{D_1}) = \text{int}(\overline{\text{conv}(D_1)}) = \text{int}(\text{conv}(D_1))$. This means that $P \in \text{int}(\text{conv}(D_1)) \cap D_2$ and, so, $P \in \text{conv}(D_1) \cap D_2$. Since $P \in D_2$, we know that $P \in \mathbb{Q}^{\binom{m}{k}}$. By Lemma 12 we know that $D_1 = \mathbb{Q}^{\binom{m}{k}} \cap \text{conv}(D_1)$. Thus, since $P \in \mathbb{Q}^{\binom{m}{k}}$ and $P \in \text{conv}(D_1)$, we know that $P \in D_1$. All in all, it must be the case that $P \in D_1 \cap D_2$, which is a contradiction because $D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset$.

Finally, for the sake of contradiction, let us assume that there exists $Q \in \overline{D}$, such that $Q \in \text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ and $Q \in \overline{D_2}$. Since $Q \in \overline{D_2}$, this means that every open set containing Q must have nonempty intersection with D_2. Consequently, $\text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ has nonempty intersection with D_2, which—by the previous paragraph—gives a contradiction. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

[15] A subset A of a topological space X is called nowhere dense (in X) if there is no neighborhood in X on which A is dense.

[16] A subset A of a topological space X is dense in X if for every point x in X, each neighborhood of x contains at least one point from A (i.e., A has non-empty intersection with every non-empty open subset of X).

Recovering the Scoring Function. We are finally ready to derive our committee scoring function. From the classic hyperplane separation theorem, it follows that there exists a vector $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{\binom{m}{k}}$ such that (for $P \in D$, by $\eta \cdot P$ we mean the dot product of P and η, both treated as $\binom{m}{k}$ dimensional vectors):

1. For each voting situation $P \in \overline{D_2}$ it holds that $\eta \cdot P \leq 0$.
2. For each voting situation $P \in \text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ it holds that $\eta \cdot P > 0$.

We note that Lemma 14 allows us to directly apply the hyperplane separation theorem as the sets $\text{int}(\overline{D_1})$ and $\overline{D_2}$ are disjoint.[17]

We now show that if $P \in D$ and $\eta \cdot P > 0$, then $P \in D_1$. Since $\eta \cdot P > 0$, P cannot belong to D_2, but it might be the case that $C_1 =_P C_2$. For the sake of contradiction, let us assume that this is the case. We observe that there exists an $\left(\binom{m}{k} - 1\right)$-dimensional ball $\mathcal{B}$ in D with $P \in \mathcal{B}$, such that for each $S \in \mathcal{B}$ we have $C_1 \succeq_S C_2$ (this is because P does not belong to $\overline{D_2}$). Let us now consider two cases.

Case 1. If for each $S \in \mathcal{B}$ we have $C_1 =_S C_2$, then we proceed as follows. Let us take some Q such that $C_1 \succ_Q C_2$. There must exist some (possibly very small) x such that $S = x \cdot Q + (1-x) \cdot P \in \mathcal{B}$. However, from consistency we would get that $C_1 \succ_S C_2$, a contradiction.

Case 2. If there exists $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $C_1 \succ_Q C_2$, then we observe that there exists $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that $S = \frac{P - \epsilon Q}{1-\epsilon} \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $S \in \mathcal{B}$, we have that $C_1 \succeq_S C_2$. Further, we have that $P = \epsilon Q + (1-\epsilon)S$. By consistency of f_{C_1,C_2} we get that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$. However, this is a contradiction.

Next, we show that if $\eta \cdot P < 0$, then $P \in D_2$. For the sake of contradiction, let us assume that there is P such that $\eta \cdot P < 0$ but $C_1 \succeq_P C_2$. Then there exists such ϵ that if $|Q - P| < \epsilon$ then $\eta \cdot Q < 0$ (and so $Q \notin \text{int}(\overline{D_1})$). Thus there exists a ball $\mathcal{B}$ in D with $P \in \mathcal{B}$, such that $\mathcal{B} \cap \text{int}(\overline{D_1}) = \emptyset$. Thus, $\mathcal{B} \cap D_1 = \emptyset$. We infer that some point S in $\mathcal{B}$ could be represented as a linear combination of P and some point from D_1. From consistency we would get that $C_1 \succ_S C_2$, a contradiction.

Remark 2. *We have shown that for each $P \in D$, (a) $\eta \cdot P > 0$ implies that $P \in D_1$ (and, so, $C_1 \succ_P C_2$), and (b) $\eta \cdot P < 0$ implies that $P \in D_2$ (and, so, $C_2 \succ_P C_1$). From symmetry, the same vector η works for each pair of committees C_1 and C_2 such that $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k - 1$.*

Now we will use continuity to prove that if $\eta \cdot P = 0$ then $C_1 =_P C_2$. For the sake of contradiction let us assume that this is not the case, i.e., that there exists a voting situation $P \in D$ such that $\eta \cdot P = 0$ but $C_1 \neq_P C_2$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$. Let Q be a voting situation such that $\eta \cdot Q < 0$ and so $C_2 \succ_Q C_1$. For each x it holds that $\eta \cdot (xP + Q) < 0$ and so $C_2 \succ_{xP+Q} C_1$. However, this contradicts continuity of f_k. Thus, for every $P \in D$, if $\eta \cdot P = 0$ then $C_1 =_P C_2$.

[17] This is different from Young's [60] and Merlin's [41] approach, who operate on sets with disjoint interiors, but which do not have to be disjoint on their own.

From vector η, we retrieve a committee scoring function λ. For each committee position $I \in [m_k]$ we set $\lambda(I) = \eta[I]$. Now, we can see that for each two committees C_1, C_2, and for each voting situation $P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!}$ it holds that (see the comment below for an explanation of what Q is):

$$\begin{aligned}\text{score}_\lambda(C_1, P) - \text{score}_\lambda(C_2, P) &= \sum_{I \in [m]_k} (\lambda(I) \cdot \text{pos-weight}_I(C_1, P) - \lambda(I) \cdot \text{pos-weight}_I(C_2, P)) \\ &= \sum_{I \in [m]_k} \lambda(I) \cdot \alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)[I] = \sum_{I \in [m]_k} \eta[I] \cdot \alpha_{C_1,C_2}(P)[I] = \eta \cdot Q,\end{aligned}$$

where $Q \in D$ is the representation of P in the space D (i.e., Q is the vector of values of the committee position-difference function α_{C_1,C_2} for profile P). From the above inequality we see that $\text{score}_\lambda(C_1, P) > \text{score}_\lambda(C_2, P)$ implies that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$ and that $\text{score}_\lambda(C_1, P) = \text{score}_\lambda(C_2, P)$ implies that $C_1 =_P C_2$. From neutrality we get that the same committee scoring function λ works for every two committees C_1' and C_2' with $|C_1' \cap C_2'| = k - 1$

There is one more issue we need to deal with. So far, we gave no argument as to why λ should satisfy the dominance property of committee scoring functions (i.e., that if I and J are two committee positions such that I dominates J, then $\lambda(I) \geq \lambda(J)$). However, to get this property it suffices to assume the committee dominance axiom for f_k.

Summarizing our discussion from this section, we get our main result, Theorem A, for the committees C_1 and C_2, with $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k - 1$. We continue our analysis in the next section.

5.4 Putting Everything Together: Comparing Arbitrary Committees

In this section we conclude the proof of Theorem A by extending the reasoning from the previous section to apply to every two committees C_1 and C_2 irrespective of the size of their intersection.

Setting Up the Proof. Let f_k be a k-winner election rule that is symmetric, consistent, continuous, and has the committee dominance property. Let λ be the scoring function derived for this f_k as described at the end of the previous section. We know that for each two committees C_1 and C_2 such that $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k - 1$ and each voting situation $P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!}$ it holds that $\text{score}_\lambda(C_1, P) > \text{score}_\lambda(C_2, P)$ if and only if $C_1 \succ_P C_2$, and $\text{score}_\lambda(C_1, P) = \text{score}_\lambda(C_2, P)$ if and only if $C_1 =_P C_2$. We will show that the same holds for all committees C_1 and C_2, irrespective of the size of their intersection. We will show this by induction over $k - |C_1 \cap C_2|$.

Let us fix some value $k' < k - 1$ and let us assume that λ can be used to distinguish whether some committee C_1 is preferred over some committee C_2 whenever $|C_1 \cap C_2| > k'$. We will show that the same λ can be used to distinguish whether committee C_1 is preferred over committee C_2 when $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k'$.

Let C_1 and C_2 be two arbitrary committees such that $|C_1 \cap C_2| = k'$. Let us rename the candidates so that $C_1 \setminus C_2 = \{c_1, \ldots, c_{k-k'}\}$, $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{c_{k-k'+1}, \ldots, c_k\}$ and $C_2 \setminus C_1 = \{c_{k+1}, \ldots, c_{2k-k'}\}$.

The Case Where $k - k'$ Is Even. If $k - k'$ is even, we consider the following two cases:

Case 1: There exists a vector of $2k - k'$ positions $\langle p_1, \ldots, p_{2k-k'} \rangle$ such that:

$$\lambda(\{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}) + \lambda(\{p_{k-k'+1}, \ldots, p_{2k-k'}\}) \neq 2\lambda(\{p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+1}, \ldots, p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+k}\}). \tag{21}$$

Let us consider the committee $C_3 = \{c_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+1}, \ldots, c_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+k}\}$. We consider the vector space of voting situations $P \in \mathbb{Q}^{m!}$ such that $C_1 =_P C_3$ and $C_3 =_P C_2$ (the fact that this is a vector space follows from the inductive assumption; $|C_1 \cap C_3| = |C_2 \cap C_3| > k'$). The conditions $C_1 =_P C_3$ and $C_3 =_P C_2$ are not contradictory (consider the profile in which each vote is cast exactly once—in such profile all size-k committees are equivalent with respect to f_k). This space has dimension either $m! - 2$ or $m! - 1$. This is so, because each of the conditions $C_1 =_P C_3$ and $C_2 =_P C_3$ boils down to a single linear equation. If these equations are independent then the dimension is $m! - 2$. Otherwise, it is $m! - 1$. By transitivity of f_k we get that in each voting situation P from this space it holds that $C_1 =_P C_2$ and that the committee score of C_1 (according to λ) is equal to the committee score of C_2. Let B be a base of this space. Further, let v be a vote where each candidate c_i, $i \in \{1, \ldots, 2k - k'\}$, stands on position p_i (recall Equation (21) above), and let v' be an identical vote except that candidates from $C_1 \cup C_2$ are listed in the reverse order (i.e., c_1 is on position $p_{2k-k'}$, c_2 is on position $p_{2k-k'-1}$ and so on). Let S_b be a voting situation that consists of v and v'. The positions of C_1 and C_3 in v are:

$$\mathrm{pos}_v(C_1) = \{p_1, \ldots, p_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{pos}_v(C_3) = \{p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+1}, \ldots, p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+k}\}$$

The positions of C_1 and C_3 in v' are:

$$\mathrm{pos}_{v'}(C_1) = \{p_{k-k'+1}, \ldots, p_{2k-k'}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{pos}_{v'}(C_3) = \{p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+1}, \ldots, p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+k}\}$$

Consequently, according to Equation (21), in voting situation S_b the committee score of C_1 is not equal to that of C_3. By the inductive assumption, it must be the case that $C_1 \neq_{S_b} C_3$. This means that the voting situations in $B \cup \{S_b\}$ are linearly independent.

We now show that $C_1 =_{S_b} C_2$. Consider a permutation σ (over the candidate set) that swaps c_1 with $c_{2k-k'}$, c_2 with $c_{2k-k'-1}$, and so on. We note that $\sigma(C_1) = C_2$, $\sigma(C_2) = C_1$, and $S_b = \sigma(S_b)$. Thus, by symmetry of f_k, it must be the case that $C_1 =_{S_b} C_2$. Further, the committee scores of C_1 and C_2 are equal in S_b.

Altogether, the base $B \cup \{S_b\}$ defines an $(m! - 1)$-dimensional space of voting situations P such that $C_1 =_P C_2$ and the committee scores of C_1 and C_2 are equal. From Corollary 1 we know that the set of voting situations P such that $C_1 =_P C_2$ forms a vector space of dimension $m! - 1$. As a result, we get that for each voting situation P the condition $C_1 =_P C_2$ is equivalent to the condition that C_1 has the same committee score as C_2 according to λ.

The fact that $C_1 \succ_S C_2$ whenever the committee score of C_1 is greater than that of C_2 follows from Lemma 7.

Case 2: For each vector of $2k - k'$ positions $\langle p_1, \ldots, p_{2k-k'} \rangle$ it holds that (note that the condition

below is a negation of the condition from Case 1):

$$\lambda(\{p_1,\ldots,p_k\})-\lambda(\{p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+1},\ldots,p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+k}\}) = \lambda(\{p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+1},\ldots,p_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+k}\}) - \lambda(\{p_{k-k'+1},\ldots,p_{2k-k'}\}).$$

As before, let $C_3 = \{c_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+1},\ldots,c_{\frac{k-k'}{2}+k}\}$. Since the above equality must hold for each vector of $2k-k'$ positions, we see that if the committee score of C_1 is equal to the committee score of C_3, then the committee score of C_3 is equal to the committee score of C_2. Consequently, by the inductive assumption, we get that $C_1 =_P C_3$ implies that $C_3 =_P C_2$. Thus, by f_k's transitivity, we get that for each voting situation P, the condition $C_1 =_P C_3$ implies that $C_1 =_P C_2$. As a consequence of this reasoning, there exists an $(m!-1)$-dimensional space of voting situations P such that $C_1 =_P C_2$ and such that C_1 has the same committee score as C_2. Similarly as in Case 1, we conclude that for each voting situation P the condition $C_1 =_P C_2$ is equivalent to the condition that C_1 has the same committee score as C_2 according to λ, and that it holds that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$ whenever the committee score of C_1 is greater than that of C_2 (by Lemma 7).

The Case Where $\mathbf{k-k' \geq 3}$ and $\mathbf{k-k'}$ is Odd. Similarly as before we consider two cases:

Case 1: There exists a vector of $2k-k'$ positions $\langle p_1,\ldots,p_{2k-k'}\rangle$ and a number $x \in \{1,\ldots k-k'\}$ such that:

$$\lambda(\{p_1,\ldots,p_k\}) + \lambda(\{p_{k-k'+1},\ldots,p_{2k-k'}\}) \neq \lambda(\{p_x,\ldots,p_{k+x-1}\}) + \lambda(\{p_{k-k'+2-x},\ldots,p_{2k-k'+1-x}\}).$$

In this case we can repeat the reasoning from Case 1 from the previous subsection (it suffices to take $C_3 = \{c_x,\ldots,c_{k+x-1}\}$).

Case 2: For each vector of $2k-k'$ positions $\langle p_1,\ldots,p_{2k-k'}\rangle$ and each number $x \in \{1,\ldots k-k'\}$ it holds that:

$$\lambda(\{p_1,\ldots,p_k\}) + \lambda(\{p_{k-k'+1},\ldots,p_{2k-k'}\}) = \lambda(\{p_x,\ldots,p_{k+x-1}\}) + \lambda(\{p_{k-k'+2-x},\ldots,p_{2k-k'+1-x}\}).$$

The above inequality for $x = \lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor$ and for $x = \lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor + 1$ gives, respectively (note that $k-k'-\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor = \lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil$):

$$\lambda(\{p_1,\ldots,p_k\}) + \lambda(\{p_{k-k'+1},\ldots,p_{2k-k'}\}) = \lambda(\{p_{\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor}\ldots,p_{k+\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor-1}\}) + \lambda(\{p_{\lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil+2}\ldots,p_{k+\lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil+1}\}),$$

and:

$$\lambda(\{p_1,\ldots,p_k\}) + \lambda(\{p_{k-k'+1},\ldots,p_{2k-k'}\}) = \lambda(\{p_{\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor+1}\ldots,p_{k+\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor}\}) + \lambda(\{p_{\lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil+1}\ldots,p_{k+\lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil}\}).$$

Together, these two equalities give that:

$$\lambda(\{p_{\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor}\ldots,p_{k+\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor-1}\})+\lambda(\{p_{\lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil+2}\ldots,p_{k+\lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil+1}\})=$$
$$\lambda(\{p_{\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor+1}\ldots,p_{k+\lfloor\frac{k-k'}{2}\rfloor}\})+\lambda(\{p_{\lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil+1}\ldots,p_{k+\lceil\frac{k-k'}{2}\rceil}\}).$$

Since the above equality holds for each vector of $2k-k'$ positions, after renaming the positions, we get that for each set of $k+3$ positions $\langle q_1,\ldots,q_{k+3}\rangle$ it holds that:

$$\lambda(\{q_1,\ldots,q_k\})+\lambda(\{q_4,\ldots,q_{k+3}\})=\lambda(\{q_2,\ldots,q_{k+1}\})+\lambda(\{q_3,\ldots,q_{k+2}\}).$$

After reformulation we get:

$$\lambda(\{q_1,\ldots,q_k\})-\lambda(\{q_2,\ldots,q_{k+1}\})=\lambda(\{q_3,\ldots,q_{k+2}\})-\lambda(\{q_4,\ldots,q_{k+3}\}). \tag{22}$$

If k is odd, we obtain the following series of equalities (the consecutive equalities, except for the last one, are consequences of applying Equation (22) to the cyclic shifts of the list $\langle q_1,q_2,\ldots,q_{k+3}\rangle$; the last equality breaks the pattern and is a consequence of applying Equation (22) to the list $\langle q_{k+2},q_{k+3},q_1,q_2,\ldots,q_{k-1},q_{k+1},q_k\rangle$):

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\{q_1,\ldots,q_k\})-\lambda(\{q_2,\ldots,q_{k+1}\})&=\lambda(\{q_3,\ldots,q_{k+2}\})-\lambda(\{q_4,\ldots,q_{k+3}\})\\&=\lambda(\{q_5,\ldots,q_{k+3},q_1\})-\lambda(\{q_6,\ldots,q_{k+3},q_1,q_2\})\\&=\lambda(\{q_7,\ldots,q_{k+3},q_1,q_2,q_3\})-\lambda(\{q_8,\ldots,q_{k+3},q_1,q_2,q_3,q_4\})\\&\quad\vdots\\&=\lambda(\{q_{k+2},q_{k+3},q_1,\ldots,q_{k-2}\})-\lambda(\{q_{k+3},\ldots,q_1,q_{k-1}\})\\&=\lambda(\{q_1,\ldots,q_{k-1},q_{k+1}\})-\lambda(\{q_2,\ldots,q_{k+1}\}),\end{aligned}$$

In consequence, it must be the case that $\lambda(\{q_1,\ldots,q_k\})=\lambda(\{q_1,\ldots,q_{k-1},q_{k+1}\})$. Thus, by transitivity, we get that λ is a constant function (in essence, what we have shown is that we can replace positions in the set of k positions, one by one, without changing the value of the committee scoring function). Let $C_3=\{c_2,\ldots,c_{k+1}\}$. Since λ is a constant function, then by the inductive assumption we have that for every voting situation P it holds that $C_1=_P C_3$ and $C_3=_P C_2$. By transitivity we get that for each voting situation P it holds that $C_1=_P C_2$. Thus our trivial scoring function works correctly on C_1 and C_2.

Let us now assume that k is even. Now we obtain the following series of equalities (in this case all the consecutive equalities are consequences of applying Equation (22) to the cyclic shifts of the sequence $\langle q_1,q_2,\ldots,q_{k+3}\rangle$):

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\{q_1,\ldots,q_k\})-\lambda(\{q_2,\ldots,q_{k+1}\})&=\lambda(\{q_3,\ldots,q_{k+2}\})-\lambda(\{q_4,\ldots,q_{k+3}\})\\&=\lambda(\{q_5,\ldots,q_{k+3},q_1\})-\lambda(\{q_6,\ldots,q_{k+3},q_1,q_2\})\\&=\lambda(\{q_7,\ldots,q_{k+3},q_1,q_2,q_3\})-\lambda(\{q_8,\ldots,q_{k+3},q_1,q_2,q_3,q_4\})\\&\quad\vdots\\&=\lambda(\{q_{k+3},q_1,\ldots,q_{k-1}\})-\lambda(\{q_1,\ldots,q_k\})\\&=\lambda(\{q_2,\ldots,q_{k+1}\})-\lambda(\{q_3,\ldots,q_{k+2}\}),\end{aligned}$$

In consequence, it is the case that:

$$\lambda(\{q_1, \ldots, q_k\}) - \lambda(\{q_2, \ldots, q_{k+1}\}) = \lambda(\{q_2, \ldots, q_{k+1}\}) - \lambda(\{q_3, \ldots, q_{k+2}\}),$$

and this holds for every sequence $\langle q_1, \ldots, q_{k+2} \rangle$ of positions. Thus, we get that for each voting situation in which $\{c_1, \ldots, c_k\}$ is equivalent to $\{c_2, \ldots, c_{k+1}\}$, it also holds that $\{c_2, \ldots, c_{k+1}\}$ is equivalent to $\{c_3, \ldots, c_{k+2}\}$, it also holds that $\{c_3, \ldots, c_{k+2}\}$ is equivalent to $\{c_4, \ldots, c_{k+3}\}$, etc. Let $C_3 = \{c_2, \ldots, c_{k+1}\}$. From the preceding reasoning we have that for each voting situation P the fact that it holds that $C_1 =_P C_3$ implies that $C_1 =_P C_2$. We conclude the proof in the same way as in the case of even $k - k'$ (Case 2). Specifically, we conclude that there exists an $(m! - 1)$-dimensional space of voting situations P such that $C_1 =_P C_2$ and such that C_1 has the same committee score as C_2. This means that for each voting situation P the condition $C_1 =_P C_2$ is equivalent to the condition that C_1 has the same committee score as C_2 according to λ, and that it holds that $C_1 \succ_P C_2$ whenever the committee score of C_1 is greater than that of C_2 (by Lemma 7).

The End. We have shown that if a k-winner rule is symmetric, consistent, continuous, and has the committee-dominance property, then it is a committee scoring rule. On the other hand, committee scoring rules satisfy all these conditions. This completes our proof of Theorem A.

6 Conclusions

We have provided an axiomatic characterization of committee scoring rules, a new class of multiwinner voting rules recently introduced by Elkind et al. [17]. Committee scoring rules form a remarkably general class of multiwinner systems that consists of many nontrivial rules with a variety of applications. Thus, our characterization constitutes a fundamental framework for further axiomatic studies of this fascinating class and makes an important step towards their understanding. We mention that various properties of committee scoring rules, and the internal structure of the class, were already studied by Elkind et al. [17] and Faliszewski et al. [20, 19]. However, they mostly focused on specific rules and on subclasses of the whole class, while this work distinguishes the class of committee scoring rules among the universe of multiwinner voting rules.

Our Theorem A required developing a set of useful tools and new concepts, such as decision rules. We believe that they are an interesting notion that deserves further study.

References

[1] K. J. Arrow. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. Wiley, New York, 2nd edition, 1963.

[2] K. J. Arrow, A. Sen, and K. Suzumura, editors. *Handbook of Social Choice & Welfare*, volume 2. Elsevier, 2010.

[3] Kenneth J Arrow, Amartya Sen, and Kotaro Suzumura, editors. *Handbook of social choice and welfare*, volume 1. Elsevier, 2002.

[4] B. Asplach. Johnson graphs are hamilton-connected. *Ars Mathematica Contemporanea*, 6(1):21–23, 2013.

[5] H. Aziz, M. Brill, V. Conitzer, E. Elkind, R. Freeman, , and T. Walsh. Justified representation in approval-based committee voting. In *Proceedings of the 29th Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2015)*, 2015.

[6] H. Aziz, S. Gaspers, J. Gudmundsson, S. Mackenzie, N. Mattei, and T. Walsh. Computational aspects of multi-winner approval voting. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, May 2015.

[7] S. Barberà and D. Coelho. How to choose a non-controversial list with *k* names. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 31(1):79–96, 2008.

[8] S. Barber and B. Dutta. Implementability via protective equilibria. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 10(1):49–65, 1982.

[9] N. Betzler, A. Slinko, and J. Uhlmann. On the computation of fully proportional representation. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47:475–519, 2013.

[10] F. Brandl, F. Brandt, and H. G. Seedig. Consistent probabilistic social choice. *Econometrica*, 84(5):1839–1880, 2016.

[11] Felix Brandt, Markus Brill, and Paul Harrenstein. Tournament solutions. In F. Brandt, V. Conitzer, U. Endriss, J. Lang, and A. D. Procaccia, editors, *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, chapter 3. Cambridge University Press, 2016.

[12] B. Chamberlin and P. Courant. Representative deliberations and representative decisions: Proportional representation and the borda rule. *American Political Science Review*, 77(3):718–733, 1983.

[13] P. Chebotarev and E. Shamis. Characterizations of scoring methods for preference aggregation. *Annals of Operations Research*, 80:299–332, 1998.

[14] S. Ching. A simple characterization of plurality rule. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 71(1):298–302, 1996.

[15] A. Copeland. A "reasonable" social welfare function. Mimeographed notes from a Seminar on Applications of Mathematics to the Social Sciences, University of Michigan, 1951.

[16] B. Debord. An axiomatic characterization of Borda's *k*-choice function. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 9(4):337–343, 1992.

[17] E. Elkind, P. Faliszewski, P. Skowron, and A. Slinko. Properties of multiwinner voting rules. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS-2014)*, May 2014. Also presented in FIT-2013.

[18] P. Faliszewski, J. Sawicki, R. Schaefer, and M. Smolka. Multiwinner voting in genetic algorithms for solving illposed global optimization problems. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on the Applications of Evolutionary Computation*, 2016. To appear.

[19] P. Faliszewski, P. Skowron, A. Slinko, and N. Talmon. Committee scoring rules: Axiomatic classification and hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-2016)*, 2016.

[20] P. Faliszewski, P. Skowron, A. Slinko, and N. Talmon. Multiwinner analogues of the plurality rule: Axiomatic and algorithmic views. In *Proceedings of the 30th Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2016)*, 2016.

[21] D.S. Felsenthal and Z. Maoz. Normative properties of four single-stage multi-winner electoral procedures. *Behavioral Science*, 37:109–127, 1992.

[22] P. Fishburn. *The Theory of Social Choice,*. Princeton University Press, 1973.

[23] P. Fishburn. Condorcet social choice functions. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 33(3):469–489, 1977.

[24] P. Fishburn. Majority committees. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 25(2):255–268, 1981.

[25] P. Fishburn and W. Gehrlein. Borda's rule, positional voting, and condorcet's simple majority principle. *Public Choice*, 28(1):79–88.

[26] P. C. Fishburn. Probabilistic social choice based on simple voting comparisons. *Review of Economic Studies*, 51(4):683–692, 1984.

[27] R. Freeman, M. Brill, and V. Conitzer. On the axiomatic characterization of runoff voting rules. In *Proceedings of the 28th Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2014)*, pages 675–681, 2014.

[28] P. Gärdenfors. Positionalist voting functions. *Theory and Decision*, 4(1):1–24, 1973.

[29] A. Gibbard. Manipulation of voting schemes. *Econometrica*, 41(4):587–601, 1973.

[30] A. Gibbard. Manipulation of schemes that mix voting with chance. *Econometrica*, 45(3):665–681, 1977.

[31] Itzhak Gilboa, David Schmeidler, and Peter P Wakker. Utility in case-based decision theory. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 105(2):483–502, 2002.

[32] B. Hansson and H. Sahlquist. A proof technique for social choice with variable electorate. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 13:193–200, 1976.

[33] B. Kaymak and R. Sanver. Sets of alternatives as condorcet winners. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 20(3):477–494, 2003.

[34] M. G. Kendall. A new measure of rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 30(1/2):81–93, 1938.

[35] D. Kilgour. Approval balloting for multi-winner elections. In J. Laslier and R. Sanver, editors, *Handbook on Approval Voting*, pages 105–124. Springer, 2010.

[36] M. Kilgour and E. Marshall. Approval balloting for fixed-size committees. In *Electoral Systems, Studies in Choice and Welfare*, volume 12, pages 305–326, 2012.

[37] J. Laslier. *Tournament Solutions and Majority Voting*. Springer, 1997.

[38] T. Lu and C. Boutilier. Budgeted social choice: From consensus to personalized decision making. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-2011)*, pages 280–286, 2011.

[39] T. Lu and C. Boutilier. Value directed compression of large-scale assignment problems. In *Proceedings of the 29th Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2015)*, pages 1182–1190, 2015.

[40] K. O. May. A set of independent necessary and sufficient conditions for simple majority decision. *Econometrica*, 20(4):680–684, 1952.

[41] V. Merlin. The axiomatic characterization of majority voting and scoring rules. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 41(161):87–109, 2003.

[42] S. Nitzan and A. Rubinstein. A further characterization of borda ranking method. *Public Choice*, 36(1):153–158, 1981.

[43] Peter C. P. Fishburn. Axioms for approval voting: Direct proof. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 19(1):180–185, 1978.

[44] P. K Pattanaik. Positional rules of collective decision-making. In K. J. Arrow, A. Sen, and K. Suzumura, editors, *Handbook of social choice and welfare*, volume 1, pages 361–394. Elsevier, 2002.

[45] T. Pereira. Proportional approval method using squared loads, approval removal and coin-flip approval transformation (pamsac) - a new system of proportional representation using approval voting. Technical Report arXiv:1602.05248v2 [cs.GT], arXiv.org, March 2016.

[46] A. Procaccia, J. Rosenschein, and A. Zohar. On the complexity of achieving proportional representation. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30(3):353–362, April 2008.

[47] F. Pukelsheim. *Proportional Representation: Apportionment Methods and Their Applications*. Springer, 2014.

[48] T. Ratliff. Some startling inconsistencies when electing committees. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 21(3):433–454, 2003.

[49] J. T. Richelson. A characterization result for the plurality rule. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 19(2):548–550, 1978.

[50] A. Rubinstein. Ranking the participants in a tournament. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 38(1):108–111, 1980.

[51] M. Satterthwaite. Strategy-proofness and Arrow's conditions: Existence and correspondence theorems for voting procedures and social welfare functions. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 10(2):187–217, 1975.

[52] M. Sertel. Characterizing approval voting. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 45(1):207–211, 1988.

[53] P. Skowron. What do we elect committees for? a voting committee model for multi-winner rules. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-2015)*, pages 1141–1148, 2015.

[54] P. Skowron, P. Faliszewski, and J. Lang. Finding a collective set of items: From proportional multirepresentation to group recommendation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 241:191–216, 2016.

[55] P. Skowron, P. Faliszewski, and A. Slinko. Achieving fully proportional representation: Approximability result. *Artificial Intelligence*, 222:67–103, 2015.

[56] J. Smith. Aggregation of preferences with variable electorate. *Econometrica*, 41(6):1027–1041, 1973.

[57] T. N. Thiele. Om flerfoldsvalg. In *Oversigt over det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Forhandlinger*, pages 415–441. 1895.

[58] R. Yager. On ordered weighted averaging aggregation operators in multicriteria decisionmaking. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 18(1):183–190, 1988.

[59] H. Young. An axiomatization of Borda's rule. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 9(1):43–52, 1974.

[60] H. Young. Social choice scoring functions. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 28(4):824–838, 1975.

[61] H. Young and A. Levenglick. A consistent extension of Condorcet's election principle. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 35(2):285–300, 1978.

[62] H. P. Young. A note on preference aggregation. *Econometrica*, 42(6):1129–1131, 1974.